3 1761 03553 9956

HANDBOUND
AT THE

UNIVERSITY OF
TORONTO PRESS

D873h
10
7447

(*Dr. DUIGENAN's*)
HISTORY OF THE IRISH REBELLION,

AN
IMPARTIAL HISTORY
OF THE LATE
REBELLION
IN
IRELAND,
AND OF THE
UNION
BETWEEN
GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

IN THREE PARTS.

PART I. Containing an Answer to the Address of the Right Hon. HENRY GRATTAN to his Fellow Citizens of Dublin.

PART II. A Fair Representation of the then Political State of Ireland.

PART III. A SPEECH in the then Irish House of Commons, on the Subject of an Incorporating Union.

322714 35
12
30

BY PATRICK DUIGENAN, L. L. D.
Member of the New Imperial Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland for the City of Armagh.

A NEW EDITION.

LONDON:
Printed for ALEX. HOGG, at the King's Arms, No. 16, Paternoster-Row.

DA
949
D8
1802

This Day is Published,

NEW EDITIONS OF

ERSKINE's

HISTORY of the Causes and Consequences of the late WAR with FRANCE, in 12mo.

By the Hon. THOMAS ERSKINE, M. P. for *Portsmouth*, *Chancellor to his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, &c. &c.*

Embellished with his Portrait by PORTER.

To which are added,

Correct Copies of the PRELIMINARY ARTICLES of PEACE, signed Oct. 1, 1801,

And the DEFINITIVE TREATY, signed at *Amiens*, March 27, 1802.

Price only 2s. 6d.

The same in Octavo, price 4s,

ALSO,

Mr. *Erskine*'s Remarkable SPEECH in the HOUSE of COMMONS, Feb. 1, 1800,

On Mr. *Pitt*'s Refusal to treat with the French Republic,

Price only 1s.

M. Allen, Paternoster-Row;
S. Gosnell, Little Queen-Street; and
T. Baylis, Greville-Street, London, } Printers.

GENERAL PREFACE.

IN this Collection of our Author's Works on the late Rebellion of Ireland, and the neceſſity of an incorporating Union between Great Britain and our Siſter Kingdom, the Reader is not only preſented with a fair Repreſentation of the then political State of the latter, but with a complete Review of all the Pamphlets which had been formerly publiſhed on this intereſting Subject, particularly one, entitled, "The Caſe of Ireland conſidered;" another, "Conſiderations on the State of Public Affairs in the Year 1799;" and "The Speech of Lord Minto in the Houſe of Peers, April 11, 1799."

A retroſpect of thoſe late diſturbances and diſtractions which have led to the now nearer alliance of Ireland to England, muſt to the ruminating mind be highly ſatisfactory, as it affords the means of comparing the preſent with the paſt, and diſplays the happy effects of that remedy (*i. e.* The Union) which was ſo judiciouſly preſcribed.

In

In perusing the following pages the Reader must be aware of the dates in which they were produced; consequently, the repeated terms of *Now*, *Present*, &c. apply to the *time of then writing*; and this having been the time of War, several *harsh expressions* must be overlooked; expressions which should have been expunged in this NEW EDITION, had the tenor of what followed permitted; but this intimation being judged sufficient, we have republished the whole without any variation, except a few occasional Notes.

PART I.

AN

ANSWER

TO THE

ADDRESS

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE

HENRY GRATTAN,

EX-REPRESENTATIVE OF THE CITY OF DUBLIN IN PARLIAMENT,

TO HIS

FELLOW CITIZENS OF DUBLIN.

BY

PATRICK DUIGENAN, L. L. D.

Thy Tongue imagineth Wickedneſs, and with *Lies* thou cutteſt like a ſharp Razor.

Thou haſt loved Unrighteouſneſs more than Goodneſs, and to talk of *Lies* more than Righteouſneſs.

Thou haſt loved to ſpeak all words that may do hurt, *O thou falſe Tongue!* PSALM lii. Ver. 3, 4, 5.

To which are added, by Way of APPENDIX,

1. The Addreſs of the Catholics of Dublin, to Mr. Grattan, with his Anſwer, at the Meeting in Francis-ſtreet.
2. Mr. Grattan's Addreſs to the Electors of Dublin.
3. Mr. Grattan's (ſuppoſed) Letter to Dr. Duigenan.

CONTENTS.

Mr. Grattan rejected with contempt the inſtructions of his conſtituents, the citizens of Dublin. Page 2

——— *reprobated tythes as a prelude to his attempt to ſubvert the Proteſtant Church eſtabliſhment in Ireland.* 3

——— *declined to offer himſelf a Candidate to repreſent the City of Dublin in the preſent Parliament from a certainty of rejection.* 7

———'*s project of reform, is a project for the ſeparation of Ireland from the Britiſh Empire.* 8

———'*s conduct in the regency buſineſs proves his deſign to ſeparate Ireland from the Britiſh Empire.* 10

——— *intrigues with the Romaniſts of Ireland to effect a ſeparation of Ireland from the Britiſh Empire.* 12

Mr.

Mr. Grattan causes a Romish Convention to assemble in Dublin. Page 16

———*'s designs favoured and supported by the republican faction in England.* 18

Character and projects of the late Mr. Edmund Burke. 19

Mr. Grattan's conduct during the short Lieutenancy of Earl Fitzwilliam. 21

———*'s outrageous conduct on the recal of Earl Fitzwilliam.* 23

———*'s factious answer to the address of the Romish assembly at Francis-street chapel.* 24

——— *openly justifies the horrible Irish massacre of* 1641. 29

Remarks on Mr. Grattan's gross abuse of the Earl of Strafford. 23

Remarks on Mr. Grattan's justification of the barbarous Romish massacre in 1641. 33

Proceedings of the Romish assembly at Francis-street Chapel on the 9th of April 1794. 41

Account of Mr. Theobald Wolfe Tone. 45

Mr. Tone's state of Ireland for the use of the French convention. 46

Mr. Grattan's list of grievances, with remarks on it. 54

———*'s views in exaggerating the power of France, and*

and depreciating that of Great Britain, and introducing the separation of America from Britain into his addreſs. Page 63

Diſcuſſion of the queſtion whether the power of Great Britain be diminiſhed by the ſeparation of America. 69

Further Remarks on Mr. Grattan's Introduction of the American Revolution in his addreſs. 70

Remarks on the different ſituations and circumſtances of America and Ireland. 74

The events of former rebellions in Ireland for the purpoſe of ſevering Ireland from the Britiſh Empire recited. 77

Mr. Grattan's charge of corruption againſt the preſent Iriſh government refuted. 83

——— *aſſiduity and ſucceſs in carrying on the* trade of *parliament.* 88

——— *violently oppoſed the act of renunciation, which alone could ſecure the independence of the Iriſh legiſlature, and his reaſons for ſo doing.* 91

——— *violently oppoſed a parliamentary cenſure on a libel publiſhed in England, purporting to be a copy of a ſpeech of Mr. Fox.* 92

——— *arguments in favour of Emancipation.* 96

Romiſh

Romiſh Titular Biſhops in Ireland have publiſhed ſeditious libels under the Title of Paſtoral Letters. P. 98

The paſtoral letter of Doctor Troy, titular archbiſhop of Dublin, with remarks upon it. 111

Further arguments of Mr. Grattan for Emancipation. 118

Mr. Grattan groſsly miſrepreſents the impediment to the Catholic claim of emancipation. 123

The real impediment to the claim of emancipation. 125

A great ſhare of temporal power adheres to, and is inſeparably connected with the ſupremacy in ſpirituals. 127

Mr. Grattan's argument drawn from the imbecility of the Pope as a temporal prince, examined and refuted. 130

——— *argument drawn from the ſtate of the province of Canada, examined and refuted.* 132

——— *aſſertion that the Iriſh Romaniſts have a natural and indefeaſible right to a full participation of the legiſlative and executive capacities, examined and refuted.* 134

——— *argument drawn from the contribution of the Romaniſts to the expenditure of the war, and their ſervice in the fleets, and armies, examined and refuted.* 137

Connexion

Connexion of England and Ireland highly advantageous to both, but more especially to Ireland. Page 141

Remarks on a pamphlet, entitled, "Some Observations on a late Address to the Citizens of Dublin." 148

Remarks on Mr. Grattan's account of the creation of boroughs. 153

Mr. Grattan's plan of reform in representation explained and exposed. 168

The question, whether any and what kind of reform in representation is necessary, discussed. 178

Objections against the present state of borough representation considered. 279

APPENDIX.

1. *The Address of the Catholics of Dublin, in* 1795, *to Mr. Grattan, with his Answer, at the Meeting in Francis-street.*

2. *Mr. Grattan's Address to the Electors of Dublin,* 1797.

3. *Mr. Grattan's (supposed) Letter to Dr. Duigenan in* 1798.

4. *Extract from the Committee of Secrecy, of the House of Lords, Friday, August* 3*d,* 1798.

TO THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE

HENRY GRATTAN.

AT the close of your parliamentary existence, the dissolution of the late Parliament of Ireland, you have thought fit to publish a letter, addressed to your fellow citizens of Dublin, stuffed with invectives which I have heard you utter in the House of Commons at the commencement of three sessions of that parliament; and prophetic denunciations of impending destruction against all your political adversaries, that is, every Protestant gentleman, of sense, honour, and spirit, in the kingdom, and every true friend of the constitution in church and state. This constitution too you have endeavoured to vilify and traduce with peculiar acrimony and malignity, and have exerted all the talents you possess to irritate and inflame the lower order of the people to resistance against lawful authority, and excite them to massacre and rebellion; thus, in your last agonies of disappointed ambition, imitating the impious and expiring tyrant in the catastrophe of a tragedy, whom the poet generally paints as expending his last breath in blasphemy, curses, and execrations.

As you have addressed this letter to your fellow citizens of Dublin, and as several positions in it might gain some credit, (at least in Great Britain, where it has been published, and industriously circulated) from the audacity of the publi-

cation, people ignorant of the facts generally thinking that no man of any character would venture to vouch the truth of positions under his signature, if they were utterly groundless; and as I have the honour of being a freeman and a freeholder of the City of Dublin, and therefore one of those whom you have addressed, I have taken up my pen to answer your letter, to detect your falsehoods, to expose your misstatements, to pluck off your mask of patriotism and public spirit, and unveil to the world your projects and designs, in all their natural deformity.

As in your letter you have abandoned all decency, and indulged, what appears from your constant practice, a natural propensity, in all kinds of the most savage abuse of every thing which must be held revered and respectable in a state whilst it has existence, and have even *out-pained Paine*; it is impossible, in answering it, strictly to adhere to all the rules of politeness, to which every decent writer is intitled from his antagonist. No man wrestles with a sweep-chimney without soil from his foot; however, I shall endeavour to keep myself as uncontaminated as possible in the contest, though my adversary be armed, as Doctor Bently is represented to be in the Battle of the Books, that is, wielding with one hand a flail, and with the other, a pot of ordure.

You begin your letter by stating, "That you have found "the citizens of Dublin gracious masters, and they have "found in you an unprofitable servant; but that so long as "the present representation in the Commons' House conti- "nues, so long must you respectfully decline the soliciting at "their hands a seat in that assembly."

The first part of this statement, that the citizens of Dublin have found in you an unprofitable servant, is very true, but it does not express the whole truth, for they have found you not only an unprofitable, but an ungrateful, disrespectful, and mischievous servant.

Mr. Grattan rejected with contempt the instructions of his constituents.

When you had acquired a reputation for parliamentary ability (considerably greater than you deserved) by retailing in the House of Commons Molyneaux's State of Ireland, and Swift's Drapier's letters, the citizens of Dublin, ignorant of your real

real character, returned you as one of their repreſentatives in the laſt parliament, without expence to you. What return have you made them? As ſoon as you had diſcloſed your dangerous project of ſubverting the religious eſtabliſhment of the country, and ſubſtituting popery in its ſtead, under the pretence of granting equality of civil privileges to all deſcriptions of his Majeſty's ſubjects (the very maſk aſſumed by King James the ſecond, when engaged in the execution of a ſimilar project,) but really with a view of ſmoothing your way to the ſubverſion of the civil conſtitution of the country, (which was alſo the deſign of King James); the corporation of the City of Dublin, alarmed at ſuch conduct in their repreſentative, aſſembled and drew up an addreſs to you, containing inſtructions for your conduct in parliament relative to the claims of the Romaniſts, as contained in an acrimonious libel on the Proteſtants of this kingdom in the form of a petition, drawn up by a Romiſh convention; and they directed you, their repreſentative, to oppoſe in parliament any further extenſion of civil privileges to the Iriſh Romaniſts, as ſubverſive of the conſtitution, they being already, in poſſeſſion of every privilege neceſſary to ſecure their liberties civil and religious, their lives and properties.

ſtituents, the citizens of Dublin.

When this addreſs was preſented to you, you rejected the inſtructions of your conſtituents with a degree of arrogance and contempt, perhaps peculiar to you; and while that parliament continued, your efforts to ſubvert the conſtitution in church and ſtate, both in and out of parliament, were violent and unremitting: you aſſembled Romiſh conventions and committees; you ſupported on every occaſion in parliament the Romiſh demands of ſubverſion of the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment; you reprobated all the laws made in this kingdom for the ſecurity of the ſtate againſt the plots, machinations, and the rebellions of the Romaniſts ſince the ſecond year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth; as the moſt effectual way of rooting out the Proteſtant religion in this kingdom.

You had before this commenced your attack upon it by a declamation in parliament againſt tithes, the ſcanty maintenance of the Proteſtant parochial clergy: It is well known,

Mr Grattan reprobated tithes, as a prelude to

his attempt to ſubvert the Proteſtant Church eſtabliſhment in Ireland.

that the parochial clergy in this kingdom do not receive one fifth part of the tithes to which they are juſtly entitled, and that they cannot obtain that fifth without great difficulty: Yet to deprive them even of this pittance, and thereby to reduce them to abſolute beggary, you pronounced a philippic in the Houſe of Commons againſt them, in which you vomited forth all the falſehoods and calumnies which you could collect from every libel againſt tithes ſince the publication of the pretended Hiſtory of Tithes, by Selden; which, as well as its offspring the ſwarm of falſe and malicious publications againſt tithes by all the hives of political waſps and hornets, the diſſenters of various denominations, afterwards printed, have been long ſince fully and ably refuted and expoſed by Montague, Tyldeſley, Leſlie, Comber, and many other learned writers. The materials of this pretended hiſtory, particularly that part of it which relates to Jewiſh antiquities, Selden himſelf chiefly ſtole from Joſeph Scaliger, as he did the materials of many others of his writings, though his literary vanity prevented him from acknowledging his plagiariſm, and though he lived to repent and be aſhamed of his pretended hiſtory.

This Pandora's box you farther enriched with all the ſcandalous ſtories reſpecting the Iriſh Proteſtant clergy, no matter whether true or falſe, which you could poſſibly collect, or which could be collected for you by a Romiſh fryar, the companion of your Attic evenings, who had himſelf publiſhed a virulent pamphlet againſt the payment of tithes to the Proteſtant clergy of Ireland, remarkable only for its petulance, ignorance, vulgarity and falſehood.

This ſpeech has been printed with your name prefixed to it, and you have not diſowned the publication: I did not indeed hear you pronounce it; but I have read it. The fryar's performance is ſomewhat inferior to the ſpeech in point of ſtile, but infinitely inferior in falſehood and malignity.

Your proceedings in this point were exactly ſimilar to thoſe of the French jacobins, who commenced their career for the general ſubverſion of all orders of the ſtate, by the abolition

abolition of tithes, and the ſlaughter and extermination of their eſtabliſhed clergy.

Thus diametrically oppoſite to the inſtructions of your conſtituents, the Proteſtant citizens of Dublin, (for Romaniſts, at the time when you were elected repreſentative for the City of Dublin, were excluded from the elective franchiſe) your conduct in parliament has been, and as diametrically oppoſite to your own often-repeated doctrine, "That repreſentatives in parliament are bound in duty to purſue the inſtructions of their conſtituents; and that acting otherwiſe they betray their delegated truſt." To put this your unfaithful conduct in ſo clear a point of view as to preclude you and your pitiful faction from any defence, I ſhall ſtate one or two other facts ſo notorious that they cannot be denied.

The corporation of the City of Dublin, lord mayor, aldermen, and common council, met in a poſt aſſembly in September, 1792, and without one diſſenting voice agreed on a letter which they cauſed to be ſent to all magiſtrates, corporations, and members of both houſes of parliament in Ireland. This letter, in a very clear, conciſe, and nervous manner, expreſſed the decided diſapprobation of this the firſt corporation in the kingdom, of the claims of the Iriſh Romaniſts to any other privileges and advantages than thoſe which they then enjoyed. It ſtated, that the Iriſh Romaniſts ought to be contented with what they then enjoyed; that is, "The moſt perfect toleration of their religion, the fulleſt ſecurity of their property, and the moſt complete perſonal liberty;" and that they ought not then, nor at any other time, attempt any interference in the government of the kingdom, as ſuch interference would be incompatible with the *Proteſtant aſcendancy*, (a term coined by you at a former period, when you declared your determination to ſupport it); and then the letter defined the preciſe meaning of the words *Proteſtant aſcendancy* in the following terms:

A Proteſtant King of Ireland;
A Proteſtant Parliament;

A Proteſtant

A Proteſtant Hierarchy;
Proteſtant Electors and Government;
The Benchers of Juſtice;
The Army, and the Revenue, through all their branches and details, Proteſtant;
And this ſyſtem ſupported by a connexion with the Proteſtant Realm of Great Britain.

In this definition, the corporation of Dublin adhered ſcrupulouſly to the laws of the land, which laws reſtricted the enjoyment of all the enumerated offices and privileges to Proteſtants only.

At the very commencement of the ſeſſion of parliament which followed the publication of this deciſive declaration of your conſtituents againſt the claims of the Romaniſts, you not only ſupported their claims in the Houſe of Commons with the utmoſt vehemence; but you treated your conſtituents with great contumely and diſdain: you even attempted ridicule on the occaſion, *invitâ Minervâ!* ridicule is not your talent; when you could not argue againſt the letter of the corporation, you ſtrove to be witty upon it; and with that view you purloined a wretched witticiſm from a paſtoral letter of the Iriſh Apoſtle of popery, the late Mr. Edmund Burke. You eſſayed a laugh; you could not excite even a ſmile in the audience; but your conſtituents were juſtly enraged at this glaring breach of the truſt they had committed to you, and this public defiance of their inſtructions on a point in which their deareſt intereſts, the ſecurity of their lives and property, were concerned.

After this faithful detail of your conduct in parliament as one of the repreſentatives of the City of Dublin, is it poſſible for imagination to conceive any impudence ſo conſummate as yours in the very exordium of your addreſs? You admit the citizens of Dublin to have been your maſters while you remained one of their repreſentatives, and *gracious maſters*, and yourſelf to have been their ſervant; and yet your conduct in parliament was one continued ſeries of active and determined hoſtility againſt them and their deareſt intereſts; ſlighting, ridiculing,

ridiculing, and reprobating their inſtructions, and exerting on all occaſions the moſt indefatigable induſtry to find out ways and means to break and defeat the truſt they had repoſed in you: yet theſe are the very perſons whom you preſume to addreſs in the ſtile of an humble ſervant, who had uſed his beſt endeavours to execute with fidelity the ſervice in which they employed him!

Mr. Grattan declined to offer himſelf a Candidate to repreſent the City of Dublin in the preſent parliament from a certainty of rejection.

As to the ſecond part of the exordium of your letter, in which, with the affectation of modeſty, ſuggeſted only by the extremity of aſſurance and deceit, you beg leave to decline the honour of ſoliciting at the hands of your fellow citizens of Dublin a ſeat in parliament ſo long as the preſent ſtate of repreſentation in the Commons' Houſe continues, you certainly never wrote it (ſhameleſs as you are) with a view to its gaining credit in the City of Dublin; you muſt have written it for circulation in England. Here we know you too well; we may cry out to you, *pete peregrinum!* you declined ſoliciting a ſeat in parliament for the City of Dublin, knowing that ſuch ſolicitation would not ſucceed; and not on account of the preſent ſtate of the repreſentation in the Commons' Houſe. You know, and we all know, that the Romaniſts have not yet had time, by the operation of the act of parliament made in their favour in 1793, to become freemen of the City of Dublin, and that all the freemen are yet Proteſtants. You found, on inſpection into the regiſter, that ſixty-eight Roman Catholics only had been regiſtered as freeholders in the County of the City of Dublin; and that therefore the Romaniſts could give you but a very feeble ſupport in an election for the City of Dublin: You knew at the ſame time, as we all know, that the whole Proteſtant body of freemen and freeholders, incenſed at your infidelity and arrogance, would have voted for any man in the community rather than for you.

When I ſay the whole Proteſtant body, I do not mean all the freemen and freeholders who paſs under the general deſcription of Proteſtants, and uſurp that title when it ſerves their intereſt; I know there are ſeveral perſons, and ſome of them freemen and freeholders, but who, (praiſe be to God!)

are

are few in number, that are Atheiſts, Deiſts, Jacobins, Republicans, and United Iriſhmen. Such of this tribe, I admit, as are freemen and freeholders, would have voted for you, *Parcit cognatis maculis, ſimilis Fera*; but their whole number is inſignificant; and, joined with the Romaniſt freeholders, they would not have amounted to one-twentieth part of the electors of the city.

Certainty of defeat then, it is notorious, prevented you from ſtanding as a candidate for the repreſentation of the City of Dublin in the preſent parliament; and the conſequence you aſſume, and which your Jacobin maſters in England, for whom you are acting the honourable part of maſter fireworker in Ireland, endeavour to confer on you, by inſinuating that you might have been elected repreſentative in the Iriſh Commons for the City of Dublin, if you would have done the city the honour to offer yourſelf a candidate for it, is founded in fraud and deception; the baſeleſs viſion flies the light of truth, as ſpectres vaniſh at the dawn of day.

Mr. Grattan's project of reform, is a project for the ſeparation of Ireland from the Britiſh Empire.

If the preſent ſtate of the repreſentation in the Houſe of Commons had determined you *not to ſolicit* (I preſume you mean *not to accept of*) a ſeat in that houſe, and if all honeſt men who wiſh to ſerve their country ſhould, as you inſinuate, alſo decline to accept of ſeats in that houſe, and if it be neceſſary for the preſervation of liberty, and the ſalvation of the country, as you maintain, that a reform ſhould be made in the ſtate of the repreſentation in the Houſe of Commons, pray, by what means is that reform to be effected?

According to the law of Ireland, as well as England for ages paſt, the ſole right of enacting new laws, and altering thoſe already eſtabliſhed, is veſted in the king, lords, and commons; no new law, nor alteration in the preſent laws, can be conſtitutionally effected, but by the joint conſent of the king, lords and commons; and if all thoſe perſons who wiſh for an alteration in the ſtate of the repreſentation of the commons now by law eſtabliſhed, whom alone you allow to be patriots deſirous of the ſalvation of their country, ſhall abdicate the Houſe of Commons, and leave it to be filled only by corrupt men, who live by their *ſtipendiary talents*, exerciſed

ciſed in what you ſtile the *trade of parliament*, who have always reſiſted your ſchemes of reform, and whoſe intereſt it is (by which alone they are guided,) to reſiſt all reform in the repreſentation, as you deſcribe them; it is plain a Houſe of Commons ſo compoſed will never vote for the reform you deſire; nor, as you ſtate it, for any reform in the preſent repreſentation of the Commons; and that therefore no reform can be effected by the conſtitutional power of the ſtate as eſtabliſhed for ages.

There is then no method left, according to you, to effect this reform, but the ſubverſion of the preſent conſtitution by rebellion, civil war, maſſacre, and ſanguinary revolution, and that by the only means of carrying ſo deſtructive a plan into execution, the introduction of a French army of Jacobin aſſaſſins, to aſſiſt their fellow aſſaſſins here, the United Iriſhmen, in ſhaking off the influence of the Britiſh Cabinet, ſtiled by you *a foreign cabinet*, and rendering this country a field of battle for the Engliſh and French nations; and, if poſſible, tearing it for ever from its ſiſter iſland; that ſuch is, and for ſome time paſt has been, your real ſcheme, it is eaſy to prove by a ſimple recital of ſome of the principal manœuvres in your political career.

Paſſing over your conſtant virulent invectives ſince your firſt entrance into the Houſe of Commons, againſt Great Britain, and its conduct reſpecting Ireland; your perpetual agitation of every circumſtance which could, even in the remoteſt degree, create jealouſy between the two countries, with the moſt acrimonious exaggeration; your reiterated harangues, tending to ſhew that the intereſts of the two nations are incompatible, except upon ſuch terms as you well know Great Britain, conſiſtent with her own ſafety, or even exiſtence as an independent nation in the preſent ſtate of Europe, could never accede to, in which you have always uſed every kind of deception and falſe colouring, that the furious zeal of a deſperate projector and a thorough contempt of condour could furniſh; I ſhall introduce the proofs of your project of ſeparating the two countries by your conduct in the regency buſineſs.

Ireland,

The conduct of Mr. Grattan in the regency buſineſs proves his deſign to ſeparate Ireland from the Britiſh Empire.

Ireland, after its conqueſt by the Engliſh, was a lordſhip, and a feudal appendage to the crown of England; and the kings of England, before the reign of Henry the eighth, were ſtiled lords, and not kings of Ireland; and the iſland was ſtiled the land, not the kingdom of Ireland. That monarch created it a kingdom, and ſtiled himſelf king, and not lord, of Ireland; but, to prevent any idea being entertained, that Ireland, from its new ſtile of a kingdom, was therefore a dominion ſeparated from the crown of England, and that the feudal annexation of it to, and dependance upon, the imperial crown of England was thereby in any manner diſſolved, impaired, or weakened, it was declared, by ſeveral ſtatutes paſſed in the parliament of Ireland, in the reign of that prince, and in almoſt every reign ſince, to the reign of Queen Anne, *that the kingdom of Ireland is inſeparably annexed, united, and belonging to, and depending upon, the imperial crown of England; and that whoever is king of England, is thereby, ipſo facto, king of Ireland*, as may be ſeen by our ſtatute book. This is clearly to be the known eſtabliſhed law of the land, in a very particular manner, by the Iriſh act of recognition of King William and Queen Mary, in the fourth year of their reign, and by the act paſſed in the ſeventh year of the ſame reign, declaring the pretended Romiſh parliament aſſembled in Dublin by King James the ſecond, after his abdication in England, an unlawful aſſembly; and none of theſe Iriſh acts have ever been repealed.

Such being the known eſtabliſhed law of Ireland, what was your conduct when from the ſudden indiſpoſition of our moſt gracious monarch, it was thought neceſſary that a regent, that is a perſon to exerciſe the kingly office during the continuance of that public calamity, or a *king pro tempore*, ſhould be appointed? The legiſlatures of the two countries being independent of each other, except in all caſes which reſpected ſuch their union, as before ſtated; and the two nations having no legal tye to bind them together, except a king common to both, which king, by the known law of Ireland, was always to be the perſon who wore the imperial crown of England; and a regent, once eſtabliſhed, being (as to power

and

and adminiſtration) to all intents and purpoſes a king, and in poſſeſſion of the crown, you immediately ſuggeſted in the Commons of Ireland, the expediency of the parliament of Ireland proceeding to the nomination of a regent for Ireland, without waiting for the determination of the parliament of Great Britain in that particular, and you ſupported the propriety of ſuch a meaſure with the utmoſt zeal, grounding the expediency of reſorting to this dangerous experiment on ſophiſtical arguments, deduced from the independence of the Iriſh legiſlature on that of Great Britain; arguing againſt the known eſtabliſhed common law of Ireland, declared and recognized by ſo many Iriſh ſtatutes; and aſſerting an unconſtitutional power to be lodged in the Iriſh lords and commons, of abrogating by their reſolutions the known law thus declared and recognized by ſtatutes; and perſuading them, that they had a right, by their votes, to nominate a regent, that is a *King pro tempore*, for Ireland, notwithſtanding the unrepealed Iriſh law, that whoever was king or regent of England, was *ipſo facto* king or regent of Ireland: and you and your party on that occaſion prevailed on a majority of the Iriſh lords and commons, led aſtray by your ſophiſtry, and not aware of the miſchief of the precedent they were about to eſtabliſh, to nominate and elect a regent for Ireland, before any regent of the Britiſh Empire was nominated in England; thus preſenting to the Britiſh parliament the mortifying and dangerous alternative, of nominating the pretended regent of the Iriſh crown, regent of the imperial crown of Great Britain; (and thereby in fact ſurrendering to the Iriſh houſes of parliament the right of nominating a regent of England): or, of compelling obedience in Ireland to the perſon to be nominated regent by the parliament of Britain, by a Britiſh army and a civil war, as England was under the neceſſity of doing, to quell the uſurpation of James the ſecond in Ireland, after he had abdicated the crown of England; thus cutting aſunder, as far as in you lay, the only bond which bound the two countries together, and laying deep the foundation of future contention, ſlaughter, and civil war; for thoſe who have aſſumed the right of nominating a regent,

will,

will, on failure of iſſue in the royal line, and on other contingencies, aſſume the right of nominating a king, or of changing the monarchical government into a republican; and a difference of opinion on ſuch great imperial queſtions between the two nations will be the certain parent of civil war, and perhaps of mutual deſtruction. In vain will you plead in excuſe or extenuation, that the perſon nominated regent in Ireland was the heir apparent of the crown, and the perſon who, it was highly probable, or even certain, would be elected regent in England; the notorious violation of the law of the land, and the precedent authorizing, and as it were inviting, ſeparation of the two countries, your own exultation on the ſucceſs of the meaſure, and your repeated triumphant expreſſions of delight, on your having eſtabliſhed ſuch a precedent; all demonſtrate that your favourite project is ſeparation, and that you would have preferred the nomination of any other perſon to the office of regent, rather than the heir apparent, had you not been convinced, that ſuch was the loyalty and attachment of the parliament of Ireland to the preſent royal family, that the very mention of any perſon, as proper to fill the office of regent, other than the illuſtrious prince who was nominated on that occaſion, would have inſtantly blaſted your whole deſign; and that great perſonage, when in the fulneſs of time he may come to mount the throne of his anceſtors, will find but little cauſe to be obliged to you for your conduct in the affair of the regency.

Mr. Grattan intrigues with the Romaniſts of Ireland to effect a ſeparation of Ireland from the Britiſh Empire.

If any doubt can be entertained of your deſign to ſeparate the two countries, to which all your proceedings tend, though you ſometimes think it neceſſary to diſavow it, the rage of diſappointed ambition and avarice with which you were inflamed on the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam from the government of this country, put you ſo much off your guard, that you almoſt threw away the maſk; it extorted from you unequivocal proofs of your dangerous intentions. It is here neceſſary to ſtate briefly your intrigues with the Romaniſts of Ireland.

This

This body, about two thirds of the inhabitants of this iſland (and not three fourths, as you conſtantly ſtate when you intend to magnify the proweſs of your men in buckram) is compoſed of two claſſes of men, the deſcendants of the old native Iriſh, and thoſe of the ancient Engliſh colony ſettled in Ireland before the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Theſe two claſſes were inveterate enemies to each other until the year 1641, the year of the barbarous Romiſh maſſacre, when the civil diſſenſions in England encouraged a rebellion in Ireland, and cauſed an union of theſe two claſſes; the old Engliſh colonies taking up arms with the view of re-eſtabliſhing and maintaining the Romiſh religion in Ireland; the native Iriſh profeſſing the ſame view, but really taking arms with the deſign of ſeparating the two nations. This union between the two claſſes has ever ſince continued, and has ſo blended them together, that they may now be ſaid to be almoſt one people; ſave that in the deſcendants of the old Engliſh coloniſts may be obſerved ſomething more of civilization, and in the deſcendants of the old native Iriſh, where they are yet unmixed with Engliſh blood, evident remains of their ancient ferocity and barbariſm. At the time of the firſt deſcent of the Engliſh in Ireland in the reign of Henry the ſecond, the country was in a ſavage ſtate; the natives lived in clans under elective chiefs, in the ſame manner as do the native Indians in America. There were no towns nor buildings in the country, except at the mouths of rivers, where the Danes and other northern nations had built ſmall towns or factories, for the purpoſe of collecting ſuch commodities for exportation as countries, however barbarous, are known to furniſh: The Engliſh coloniſts poſſeſſed themſelves of, and ſettled in, ſome part of the nation oppoſite to Britain, and a conſtant predatory and deſultory war was waged between theſe colonies and the ſavage natives for ſome centuries, until the acceſſion of Queen Elizabeth. In her reign the Spaniſh monarch, then the mightieſt potentate in Europe, deſigning to ſubject England, caſt his eyes on Ireland as that part of the Britiſh dominion which it would be eaſieſt to ſubjugate, as an acquiſition the poſſeſſion of which would facilitate, or rather

rather enforce his ſucceſs againſt Great Britain; and with this view he furniſhed the native Iriſh with arms, ammunition, and officers; ſent an army twice to their aſſiſtance, and rendered them ſo formidable, that the queen found it neceſſary to ſend great bodies of Engliſh troops from time to time to this country, and at length a great and formidable army (for that age), conſiſting of twenty-two thouſand men, and commanded by her moſt favoured general. She at length compleated the reduction of this iſland, but died before ſhe could reap the fruit of her conqueſt. Her ſucceſſor, King James the firſt, ſent numerous colonies of induſtrious Engliſh and Scotch into this kingdom, received the native Iriſh into the maſs of his ſubjects, extended the Engliſh laws and civilization over the whole nation, and encouraged induſtry, manufactures, and population; yet the natives, wedded to their barbarous cuſtoms, abhorred their conquerors, and in two ſubſequent rebellions, one in the reign of Charles the firſt, the other in that of King William and Queen Mary, endeavoured to ſever this nation from Britain; and the maſs of Iriſh Romaniſts at this day, particularly that part of it which is compoſed of the native Iriſh (infinitely the moſt numerous) ſo deteſt the Engliſh nation, that it may be aſſerted with great probability, they continue Romaniſts more from hatred to the Engliſh, who are Proteſtants, than from any conviction of the truth of the Roman Catholic doctrines, as diſtinguiſhed from thoſe of the Proteſtants; for they are in general the loweſt order of the people of this country, and very ignorant. One thing is certain, that they account every Proteſtant in the country, even though deſcended from their own ſepts, an Engliſhman: and that they have but one word in their language to ſignify Engliſhman and Proteſtant, to wit, *Saſonagh*.

When you firſt entertained your project of ſeparating the two countries, namely in the time of the American war, you found, that the perſons who profeſſed themſelves friendly to ſuch a project, that is, the herd of republicans, conſiſting chiefly of atheiſts, deiſts and diſciples of Voltaire, Rouſſeau, Paine, Price, and Prieſtley, were in number, conſequence, and

and property, ſo inſignificant, that you could nevery carry it into execution with ſo inadequate a power as they could furniſh. The whole real Proteſtant body of the inhabitants of Ireland, by which I mean all ſincere chriſtians of that perſuaſion, whether of the eſtabliſhed church, (the moſt numerous claſs) or diſſenters, you well knew, would reprobate ſuch a meaſure the moment you ſhould venture to diſcloſe it to them, and with the greateſt alacrity riſque their lives and fortunes in reſiſting the execution of it. You knew the hatred which the Iriſh Romaniſts entertained of the Britiſh name and nation; you knew their attachment to the Stuart race was extinguiſhed with that race, and that even that attachment originated with, and was continued by, the hope, that the intereſt of the houſe of Stuart with the French court would obtain ſuccours for the Iriſh Romaniſts, to enable them to break off their connexion with Great Britain, and to create a king of their own, or an independent republic; and it was perfectly indifferent to them whether the government in Ireland was monarchical or republican, ſo that it had no connexion with the Britiſh government. You therefore looked to the Iriſh Romaniſts, as the moſt powerful auxiliaries that you could obtain for the execution of your project, from their numbers and inveteracy againſt England. They were poor, it is true; they had not in their poſſeſſion one-fiftieth part of the real, nor one-twentieth part of the perſonal property of the nation; but they laid claim to almoſt the whole landed property, of which they thought their anceſtors were unjuſtly deſpoiled by the Engliſh coloniſts; and theſe claims, together with their poverty and ſavage antipathy to the Proteſtants of the country (all of whom, as I have already obſerved, they reputed Engliſhmen,) you thought would excite them to rapine and ſlaughter, and their numbers would enſure ſucceſs. Your ambition and avarice preſented to your imagination the elevated and lucrative ſituation of preſident of the congreſs of the Iriſh republic as attainable by you: with theſe views you determined to court the Iriſh Romaniſts; and to convince them of your attachment to them, and your hoſtility to the Proteſtants, you

commenced

commenced your operations by an attack on the parochial clergy of the eſtabliſhed church, and on tithes their only ſubſiſtence.

Mr. Grattan cauſes a Romiſh Convention to aſſemble in Dublin.

The Iriſh nobility and gentry of the Romiſh perſuaſion of ancient families and eſtates are very few; the nobility of that deſcription not exceeding four or five, and the gentlemen of any conſequence not exceeding twenty. Theſe were generally men of honour, and averſe from any ſchemes of democratical republics. You knew, therefore, that your application to them would be fruitleſs; but there were men of other deſcriptions among the Romaniſts, well ſuited to your purpoſe: theſe were men of very low and mean parentage, who, by great attention to trade and commerce, had amaſſed conſiderable fortunes, and from the nature of their reſpective trades and employments, had great and extenſive connexions among the loweſt order of their perſuaſion, particularly in cities and trading towns. To ſuch men you applied yourſelf, diſcloſed your ſcheme, and the means you intended, with their co-operation, to purſue for the execution of it. You gave them your inſtructions for the different parts they were to act in the buſineſs, and you found them very apt ſcholars. Theſe are the perſons whom you ſtile in your letter *that part of the great body of the Catholics, the moſt popular and energetic.*

In conſequence, and in execution of theſe inſtructions, a Romiſh merchant in Dublin, who had very ſhortly before emerged from the loweſt order of ſociety into mercantile opulence and conſequence, and who had been for a conſiderable time your private agent for managing your intrigues with the Romaniſts, iſſued out formal writs for the election of a Romiſh convention to aſſemble in Dublin at a certain time limited in the writs. The French revolution having ſhortly before blazed forth, and a national aſſembly having been elected in that ill-fated country, theſe writs directed that the elections throughout Ireland ſhould be carried on in the ſame manner, and on the ſame plan, which had been adopted in France for the election of their national aſſembly. So well were the Iriſh Romaniſts prepared previous to this election, that

that theſe writs were executed throughout the whole nation; a Romiſh convention in conſequence met in Dublin, and drew up one of the moſt falſe and acrimonious libels againſt the Proteſtant government of this country, that could poſſibly be deviſed, ſtiled it a petition to his majeſty, and cauſed it to be preſented as ſuch. The then chief governor of Ireland did not think fit to diſperſe this unlawful meeting, and it continued ſitting with the doors of the apartment in which it aſſembled, carefully cloſed and guarded for a conſiderable ſpace of time, to the great reproach of thoſe who were then intruſted with the regulation of the police of the country; and when at length the members of it thought fit to cloſe their ſitting, they appointed a permanent committee whom they ſtiled *the Committee of the Catholics of Ireland*,* conſiſting of nine perſons who had been the moſt active amongſt them, two or three of them merchants, as many men whom they ſtiled doctors of phyſic, the reſt ſhopkeepers, manufacturers, or tradeſmen in Dublin.

The ſucceſs of ſo daring a meaſure as the preceding, and the ſupineneſs of government on the occaſion, gave your Romiſh and infidel allies ſpirits and courage to aſſemble provincial conventions of republicans and other traitors, for the purpoſe of procuring and publiſhing reſolutions of ſupporting and carrying into effect projected innovations in the ſtate, ſubverſive of the firſt principles of our conſtitution; and at length to ſummon a general convention of theſe miſcreants, from all parts of the nation to meet at Athlone,

* Of this committee two, to wit, M'Nevin and Sweetman, having been arreſted on charges of high-treaſon, confeſſed their treaſons, and particularly M'Nevin, before the Secret Committees of the Houſes of Lords and Commons. They are at preſent at Fort George in Scotland, where they are confined; an act has paſſed for their perpetual baniſhment; government, in conſideration of their diſcoveries, having ſpared their lives.

Braughall, another of them, was a long time confined under a charge of high-treaſon, but has been lately liberated; he has perhaps purchaſed his freedom by giving private and uſeful information to government.

M'Cormick, ſecretary to the committee, has fled out of the kingdom, to evade the puniſhment of his crimes.

Ryan, one of the committee, is dead; and ſome others of them have departed out of this kingdom, to which, it is to be hoped, they never will

one of the king's garriſons in the heart of the kingdom, for the ſame traitorous purpoſes.

The ſtate was at length rouſed from its lethargy, and the parliament paſſed an act to ſuppreſs ſuch dangerous aſſemblies. The furious oppoſition you gave to this act in the Houſe of Commons, as well as to the act for reſtraining the ſale of gun-powder by certain regulations, when theſe confederated traitors were forming magazines of ammunition in different parts of the kingdom; and to the inſurrection act, to prevent the nightly robberies and murders continually committed on the peaceable inhabitants, by gangs of theſe confederates ſtiling themſelves *United Iriſhmen*; your conſtant inſertion of theſe acts in your bead-roll of pretended grievances ever ſince, and your complaints of them in your preſent addreſs, all demonſtrate how much you think the execution of your project of ſeparation impeded by the operation of theſe ſalutary ſtatutes.

Mr. Grattan's deſigns favoured and ſupported by the republican faction in England.

Thus defeated in Ireland, your maſters, the *republican faction* in England, were conſulted; they looked to an inſurrection in Ireland as the moſt effectual mode of raiſing a clamour againſt the miniſters in England, and diſtreſſing and perhaps overturning the government there. It was repreſented to them, that the moſt powerful engines they could uſe for undermining the preſent power of the government in Ireland were the ſubverſion of the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment in Ireland, and the ſubſtitution of popery in its room; that the maſs of Iriſh Romaniſts having a rooted averſion to the Britiſh name and nation, and having for more than a century looked to the French nation for aſſiſtance to enable them to throw off all connexion with Great Britain, had heretofore ſhewn ſome marks of attachment to the monarchical form of government, by their adherence to the intereſts of the Stuart family; but that this ſeeming attachment to monarchy was adopted by them merely on the ſuppoſition, that the Stuart family, by its influence at the court of France, could procure them the means of ſeparating themſelves from England, and from complaiſance to the then monarchical government of France: but that now, the Stuart family being extinct, republicaniſm being eſta-

bliſhed

bliſhed in France by the revolution, and alſo in America, by a ſucceſsful rebellion, (which by the aſſiſtance of the French was lopped off from the Britiſh Empire, and formed into an independent republic,) the whole body of the Romaniſts of Ireland had thrown off the maſk, and declared themſelves determined republicans; at leaſt that part of them which you ſtile the moſt *popular and energetick*: that their ancient nobility and gentry were, as to number, and influence with the maſs of their perſuaſion, contemptible; that the *energeticks* had lately baniſhed them both from their aſſemblies and councils; that the body of republicans in Ireland diſtinct from the Romiſh body, though perfectly agreeing in opinion with the Engliſh republicans, being all Atheiſts, Deiſts and diſciples of Voltaire, Rouſſeau, Paine, Price and Prieſtley, paſſing under the general name of Diſſenters, were too few and too weak to attempt a revolution with any proſpect of ſucceſs without the co-operation of the Romaniſts; and that ſuch Proteſtant Diſſenters as were real chriſtians, being greatly the majority of that claſs of people, would, on any attempt to ſubvert the eſtabliſhed government, join heart and hand with their brethren the Proteſtants of the eſtabliſhment.

Theſe reaſons prevailed on your Engliſh maſters to lend their aid to the plan of ſubverting the eſtabliſhed church of Ireland, and ſubſtituting popery in its room, as the firſt ſtep to a republican revolution; and by the artful intrigues of this Engliſh faction in the Britiſh cabinet, Earl Fitzwilliam was ſelected as a proper perſon to fill the important employment of Lord Lieutenant of this kingdom. This nobleman was himſelf an enemy to republicaniſm, and utterly ignorant of the intrigues of the faction; but they had the art, nevertheleſs, to render him a ready tool for carrying into execution this their firſt ſtep towards a republic.

Character and projects of the late Mr. Edmund Burke.

The late Mr. Edmund Burke, a man of ſplendid but not ſolid talents, had obtained the confidence of this nobleman to ſuch a degree, that he regulated all his political exertions with unbounded authority.—Mr. Burke was himſelf ſprung from parents who were Iriſh Romaniſts; he received his early education in the College of Dublin; but having quit-

ted Ireland at a very early period of life, and all his relations by blood or alliance being Iriſh Romaniſts, he became thoroughly tinged, or rather dyed in grain, with the political ſentiments of that claſs of people. He had procured the favour and protection of the late Marquis of Rockingham, uncle to Earl Fitzwilliam, who obtained for him a ſeat in the Britiſh Houſe of Commons, in which, during the American war, he conſtantly harangued with the utmoſt vehemence in favour of the Americans, and by promoting ill humours and diſſenſions at home, conduced as much as any man in England to the ſeparation of America from the Mother Country. Indeed it may be truly ſaid, that the ill ſucceſs of the Britiſh arms in America was in a greater degree owing to intrigues of a republican faction at home, one of the active leaders of which at that time was Mr. Burke, than to the power either of France or America. Encouraged by the ſucceſs of the American rebellion, Mr. Burke formed the dangerous project of overturning the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment in Ireland, and ſubſtituting popery in its room; and with that view he exerted all his abilities to purſuade ſeveral very popular and powerful Engliſh noblemen, that the only method of retaining Ireland in obedience to the Britiſh crown, and maintaining the connexion between the two countries, was the complete eſtabliſhment of popery in Ireland; and that the irreconcilable difference of the eſtabliſhed religion of the inhabitants of the two nations reſpectively would be the indiſſoluble cement of peace and union between them.

As a convincing argument in favour of the practical truth of this new and ſtrange doctrine, he adduced the example of England and Scotland before the union, where difference of religious eſtabliſhments had produced no ſeparation, artfully ſuppreſſing in his repreſentations, that though the religious eſtabliſhments of the two countries laſt mentioned were in ſome particulars different, yet they were both Proteſtant eſtabliſhments, agreeing in all material matters of faith, and differing in diſcipline only. He magnified the numbers, wealth, and power of the Iriſh Romaniſts beyond all bounds of truth, and actually perſuaded theſe noblemen, utterly

utterly ignorant of the real ſtate of Ireland, that the Iriſh Romaniſts, if not gratified by the proſcription of the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment, and the ſubſtitution of popery in its room, would withdraw the Iriſh nation from its connexion with Great Britain, and form themſelves into an independent government, after the example of America; adding, that they were ſufficiently powerful to effect ſuch a revolution.

Whether Mr. Burke had, at the time he formed his project of eſtabliſhing popery in Ireland, entertained it only as a ſtep toward a ſeparation of Ireland from the Britiſh Empire, is not quite clear, though his ſtrong attachment to republican principles during the American war gives good ground for ſuſpecting him of ſuch a deſign: it is, however certain, that he concealed with great care this part of his plan (if it was a part) from his patron, and the great noblemen to whom he had acceſs by his means; and when the French revolution blazed forth, and conſumed all religions in that country, and popery its eſtabliſhed religion among the reſt, Mr. Burke changed, or affected to change, all his former opinions in favour of republicaniſm ſo often repeated in his moſt flaming harangues, and wrote with great violence againſt the French republicans; for which change, if it was real, no other probable reaſon can be adduced, than the ſubverſion of popery in France by theſe republicans, which he ſtiles in one of his lateſt productions the pulling down the *majeſty* of religion.

Under the influence, or rather under the abſolute controul of ſuch a man, wedded to the promotion of the intereſts of popery, did Earl Fitzwilliam take upon him the government of this kingdom. Your maſters in England gave you immediate notice of the ſucceſs of their intrigues, that they had procured the delivery of this kingdom into the hands of a perſon the fitteſt in the world for their and your purpoſe; and you immediately ſet off for England to prepare and ſharpen your tool for the effectual execution of the work in which you intended to employ him.

Happily for this kingdom, your preſumptuous precipitancy marred your project; you ſet your engine immediately to Mr. Grattan's conduct during

the ſhort Lieutenancy of Earl Fitzwilliam.

to work with ſo much violence that the whole machinery fell ſuddenly to pieces. You poſted back to this kingdom, to anticipate any popularity which the Lord Lieutenant might obtain among the Romaniſts by conſigning the power of the ſtate to their hands, and by the ruin of the Proteſtant intereſt in Ireland, as far as he could effect it. You were jealous of the fame of ſo glorious an atchievement, and one ſo conducive to the ſucceſs of your project of ſeparation, and were unwilling to ſhare it even with the chief governor. You were deſirous that your allies, the *energetick* Iriſh Romaniſts, ſhould be convinced that he was only your engine in the buſineſs, and that the whole merit was your own. You immediately aſſembled the ſtanding committee of the Romaniſts already mentioned, conſiſting of nine perſons, traders, mechanicks, and men ſtiling themſelves doctors of phyſic.

This ſtanding committee were cramped a little in the exerciſe of their authority over the whole body of Romaniſts in this kingdom by the convention bill; and you and they together, not daring in open violation of the law, to ſummon a new Romiſh convention, took however as effectual, though not ſo daring, a method of proclaiming the general union and confederacy of the Iriſh Romaniſts againſt the conſtitution. You and your nine worthies drew up and publiſhed a kind of manifeſto under the guiſe of a petition to parliament, wherein was demanded, as a matter of right, a full and perfect communication of all privileges and offices of the ſtate, without exception, to the Romaniſts; that no diſtinction in theſe particulars ſhould be continued between them and Proteſtants; and that all laws which created ſuch diſtinctions, and which had been enacted in Ireland ſince the commencement of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, ſhould be repealed.

The committee publiſhed advertiſements in moſt of the public Newſpapers, addreſſed to the Romaniſts in all counties, cities, towns, and boroughs, throughout the kingdom; ordering them immediately to draw up ſimilar manifeſtoes, under the guiſe of petitions to parliament, and tranſmit them to their ſecretary, a manufacturer in the liberties of the City of Dublin, and a moſt *energetick* Romaniſt.

Theſe

Theſe orders were complied with by the Romaniſts in every quarter of the kingdom with great expedition; the ſeveral manifeſtoes were almoſt in the ſame words with that drawn up by you and your *energetick committee*; and were all preſented to parliament on its meeting, with long liſts of names ſubſcribed to each.

The Lord Lieutenant arrived in this kingdom ſhortly after you, and acted in every thing exactly conformable to your advice. The great law officers of the crown were immediately diſmiſſed from their employments, as were many others of great family and abilities from ſeveral moſt important offices in the ſtate, without any reaſon being aſſigned for their diſmiſſal, other than that they were Proteſtants adverſe to your meaſures, and that you wanted their employments for your own creatures. Open menaces of removing the Lord Chancellor were thrown out, and if your domination had continued, he might probably have been ſucceeded by a Romaniſt. The court of the viceroy was crowded with Romaniſts of the loweſt condition, the moſt obtruſive and active among the mob of that perſuaſion; (ſuch perſons as your admired apoſtle Mr. Paine calls *nobles by nature*) the *moſt popular and energetick* Romaniſts, were ſeated at the feſtive board of the Earl Fitzwilliam, to the no ſmall degradation of his great ſtation.

Mr. Grattan's outrageous conduct on the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam

The miniſtry of England, at length rouſed from their lethargy by the rapidity of your revolutionary progreſs in this country, found it neceſſary ſuddenly to recall the unfortunate nobleman whom you, with the aſſiſtance of Mr. Edmund Burke, had duped into ſuch deſtructive meaſures, and all your plans of avarice and ambition were defeated at one ſtroke. The rage of you and your allies, the *popular and energetick Romaniſts*, burſt forth on this occaſion with the utmoſt fury. Your committee, at your inſtance, ſummoned a general meeting of their party at a Romiſh Chapel in the city of Dublin; they there reſolved to ſend deputies to London with a petition to his majeſty, praying that he would continue Lord Fitzwilliam, that is, you, in the government of Ireland, and ſtuffed, as uſual with them, with

all manner of ſhameleſs falſehoods; for your Romiſh party had, from the beginning of your operations, totally abandoned all regard to truth, thinking that the impudence and audacity of their aſſertions would gain credit to ſome of them, at leaſt in England, where, from the ignorance which prevailed reſpecting the internal ſtate of Ireland, honeſt men might be induced to think, that even the moſt hardened lyars would not openly publiſh ſuch details, and preſent them to the throne, without ſome foundation or colour of truth.

One of theſe daring falſehoods, with which all the publications of your Romiſh allies were at that time and have been ever ſince garniſhed, was that, what with equal falſehood and deceit they are pleaſed to ſtile *the emancipation* of the Roman Catholics was impatiently wiſhed for by the Proteſtants of Ireland; and the Romiſh aſſemblies, to countenance this falſehood in ſeveral of their reſolutions, which they cauſed to be oſtentatiouſly publiſhed in the daily Newſpapers both in England and Ireland, with great gravity returned thanks to their Proteſtant brethren, for their cooperation in the great work of their emancipation; though it is notoriouſly known in Ireland, that the great body of Proteſtants view ſuch a meaſure with abhorrence; that thoſe who paſs under the general denomination of Proteſtants, and give any countenance or ſupport to ſuch a meaſure, are generally republicans, and avowed diſciples of Paine, Price, and Prieſtley, or timid perſons who dread the horrors of a Romiſh rebellion; and (praiſed be God!) among the maſs of people paſſing under the general deſcription of Proteſtants in Ireland, republicans, infidels, blaſphemers and cowards are very few, and inconſiderable with reſpect to power or property.

Mr. Grattan's factious anſwer to the addreſs of the Romiſh aſſembly at Francis-ſtreet chapel on the recall of Earl Fitz-william.

This aſſembly alſo voted an addreſs to you: your anſwer to which very plainly points out your deſign of ſeparating the two countries, and the uſe you intended to make of the Romaniſts in the execution of that deſign.

I ſhall here take the liberty of reminding you of a few paſſages in that anſwer, which together with the addreſs was printed on one ſheet of paper, and ſent in thouſands over

all

all Ireland, with advice to all Romaniſts to have the ſheets framed and glazed, and hung up for peruſal in all their houſes.

This anſwer was publiſhed in March, 1795, at the time when the Britiſh Empire was actually engaged in a furious war with a ſavage enemy, the enemy of mankind in general! not for advantage, for commerce, or for dominion; but for preſervation, for exiſtence as a free country. You therein inſert the following paſſages, addreſſed to the Iriſh Romaniſts:

" Let me adviſe you by no means to poſtpone the con-
" ſideration of your fortunes till after the war; rather let
" Britain receive the benefit of your zeal during the exigency
" which demands it.

" My wiſh is, that you ſhould be free *now*; there is no
" other policy which is not low and little; let us at once
" *inſtantly* embrace, and greatly emancipate.

" If he (Earl Fitzwilliam) is to retire, I condole with my
" country. For myſelf, the pangs on that occaſion which I
" ſhould feel at rendering up my ſmall portion of miniſte-
" rial breath, would be little, were it not for the gloomy
" proſpects afforded by thoſe dreadful guardians which are
" likely to ſucceed. I tremble at the return of power to
" your old *taſk-maſters*. That combination which galled
" the country with its tyranny, inſulted her by its manners,
" exhauſted her by its rapacity, and ſlandered her by its ma-
" lice; ſhould ſuch a combination (at once inflamed as it
" muſt be now by the favour of the *Britiſh court*, and by
" the reprobation of the *Iriſh people*) return to power, I have
" no heſitation to ſay, that they will *extinguiſh Ireland, or*
" *Ireland muſt remove them*. It is not your caſe only, but
" that of the nation; I find the country already *committed*
" in the ſtruggle; I beg to be committed along with her,
" and to abide the iſſue of her fortunes."

Then the anſwer, after remarking that the Iriſh parliament had voted great ſupplies, goes on to ſay, " And
" when this country came forward, cordial and confident,
" with the offering of her treaſure and blood, and reſolute
" to ſtand or fall with the Britiſh nation, it is no proof

" of

" of wiſdom or generoſity to ſelect that moment to plant " a dagger in her heart."

Though the manifeſt tendency of your anſwer (being all in the ſame ſtrain with the above ſelected paſſages) was to excite the Romaniſts of Ireland to inſurrection, for the purpoſe of ſevering the iſland from the Britiſh Empire during the war with France, which would enſure the inſurgents the aſſiſtance of the French aſſaſſins; yet it may not be impertinent to inſert, in this my anſwer to your moſt impudent addreſs to the citizens of Dublin, a few comments on the above paſſages, as my anſwer is not intended for your peruſal alone, but for the peruſal of my fellow citizens of Dublin, and of all other my countrymen into whoſe hands it may fall.

It is proper to remark here, that the Iriſh Romaniſts, before the lieutenancy of Earl Fitzwilliam, were intitled to every civil privilege and advantage to which Proteſtants were intitled; ſave only that their obſtinate refuſal of the oath of ſupremacy, and of the oaths and engagements preſcribed to be taken by the teſt act, precluded the few Iriſh peers of that perſuaſion from voting in the Houſe of Lords, and their commoners from ſeats in the Houſe of Commons. They were alſo, by the ſame means, precluded from filling about 32 civil employments, among which were the offices of Lord Lieutenant, Lord Chancellor, Judges, and Commander in Chief of the army; in the perſons filling which offices was veſted the ſuperior executive authority of the ſtate; ſituations of legiſlative and executive authority, which can never be conceded to Romaniſts while they deny the ſupremacy of the ſtate, and while even the form of a Proteſtant eſtabliſhment is preſerved in Ireland.

In fact, the Iriſh Romaniſts, previous to the arrival of Earl Fitzwilliam, enjoyed a more rational, a more extenſive, and better ſecured civil liberty, than the moſt favoured claſs of ſubjects in any ſtate in the known world, thoſe of Great Britain only excepted; yet you and your party harangued and addreſſed what you call the *popular and energetick* part of them into an opinion that they were ſlaves; fraudulently and

and maliciouſly ſtiled the ſubverſion of the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment in church and ſtate, *emancipation* of the Roman Catholics; and told them that they muſt work their own deliverance, when the Britiſh Empire is involved in a war with a potent neighbouring nation, which has declared by public decree, that it will ſupport and aſſiſt the ſubjects of all ſtates who ſhall rebel againſt their rulers.

The true and palpable conſtruction of the words, "Let me "adviſe you by no means to poſtpone the conſideration of "your fortunes till after the war. My wiſh is that you "ſhould be free *now*; there is no other policy which is not "low and little; let us at once inſtantly embrace and great-"ly emancipate. You muſt deſtroy your former dreadful "guardians, your old taſk-maſters, or they will extinguiſh "you. The country is already committed in the ſtruggle; "I beg to be committed along with her, and to abide the "iſſue of her fortunes;" is, *fly to arms immediately; deſtroy by fire and ſword all Proteſtants who oppoſe your pretenſions, and all the great Proteſtant officers of ſtate, many of whom I diſplaced in the ſhort interval of my domination, and intended to have done ſo by the reſt: they are all taſk-maſters, and keep you in worſe than Egyptian bondage. You have no time to loſe; if you don't diſpatch them before a peace ſhall be concluded, they will extinguiſh you. Great Britain can ſend no aſſiſtance to the Proteſtants of Ireland; you are the Iriſh people, the country, the nation; the Proteſtants are but a handful. England is not able to defend herſelf againſt France when your aſſiſtance is withdrawn from her; the French will aſſiſt you with innumerable hoſts; I myſelf will be your general. If you wait till a peace is concluded between Great Britain and her enemies, you will be too late.* Your preſent addreſs is replete with the ſame doctrines, as I ſhall hereafter make more fully appear.

Your confederates, the *popular and energetic* Romaniſts, have not neglected your advice, ſo far as their abilities enabled them to follow it. A very conſiderable number of the Iriſh Romaniſts, and much the largeſt portion of them, preferred peace, quiet, and the exerciſe of their lawful occupations, protected by civil liberty, to rapine and murder.

The

The whole body, though they amounted to two-thirds of the inhabitants of the iſland, yet were not in poſſeſſion of one-twentieth part of the real and perſonal property of the kingdom, taken together. Hence, from a diſapprobation of ſo wicked a meaſure in a large part, and from inability in the reſt, (and indeed in the whole, if they had been unanimous) no open general rebellion of the Romaniſts followed the diſmiſſal of Earl Fitzwilliam; but aſſaſſination, nightly murder, robbery, and conflagration through a conſiderable part of the kingdom immediately followed this your flagitious publication; and in your preſent you openly avow, that theſe calamities are the conſequences of the rejection of what you ſtile Catholic emancipation. Adverting to the preſent convulſions in this kingdom, in your addreſs, you write thus: "They (that is the government) have told us "at ſome times, though at other times they have ſaid the "contrary, that it is the ſpirit of plunder, not politics, that "is abroad: idle talk, whatever be the crime of the pre-"ſent ſpirit, it is not the crime of theft; if ſo, it were eaſi-"ly put down: no, it is a *political* not a predatory ſpirit, "it is the ſpirit of *political reformation*," that is, *Catholic emancipation*: for in your late project of reform, propoſed in the Houſe of Commons, the firſt and principal part of the reformation which you and your party declared muſt precede all further reform, was Catholic emancipation, ſo that the diſciples of the Proteſtant reformers, who had two centuries ago converted the nation from what our fooliſh anceſtors thought the errors of popery, were to be re-reformed into popery, for the re-eſtabliſhment of civil liberty; and popery and liberty were indiſſolubly connected by the dogmas of you and your faction, inſtead of popery and ſlavery heretofore coupled together in the political creed of our ſilly anceſtors; and you openly and audaciouſly avow, that all the preſent nightly aſſaſſinations, robberies, and burning of houſes, the horrible murders of multitudes of Proteſtant clergymen, magiſtrates, witneſſes, and others, with the dreadful conſpiracy for the murder of more, ariſe from the ſpirit of *political reformation* which you and your faction have

have ſent abroad among *the popular and energetic Romaniſts*, that is, the dregs of the mob of that perſuaſion; and this ſpirit is conjured up by a faction contemptible in number, never amounting to thirty, as well as I recollect, on any queſtion in the Houſe of Commons ſince the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam, of which five or ſix only at any one time were members for counties, and frequently reduced to ſeven.

Mr. Grattan openly juſtifies the horrible Iriſh maſſacre in 1641.

But, ſir, it is not ſurprizing that you, who have ſo repeatedly harangued and addreſſed for Catholic emancipation and reform of the Commons' Houſe, by which, as I ſhall demonſtrate before I quit you, you mean the ſubverſion of the Proteſtant religion in Ireland, ſeparation of the iſland from the Britiſh Empire, and an Iriſh republic; I ſay, it is not ſurprizing that you ſhould juſtify the preſent nocturnal murders and outrages of an Iriſh banditti, and fine them down by repreſenting them as ariſing "from the ſpirit of "political reformation carried to different degrees; to *liberty* "*in moſt inſtances*; to ambition in others; and to power in "others," and again, "here there may be conſpiracy; there "may be republicaniſm; there may be a ſpirit of plunder "mixing in the public cauſe; but it is a public cauſe; and "let no man perſuade you that *it is not the cauſe of liberty* "*on one ſide and tyranny on the other*;" when you had the audacity in the ſame addreſs to juſtify the horrible Iriſh maſſacre of the year 1641, and to falſify hiſtory in the moſt palpable manner for that purpoſe.

This, ſir, you did; and although at the firſt view it may ſeem that you digreſſed a little from the propoſed ſubject of your addreſs, to wit, the juſtification of your own parliamentary conduct, in juſtifying the Iriſh maſſacre; to thoſe who ſhall attentively conſider your addreſs, as I have done, it will clearly appear, that you have inſerted this juſtification of that dreadful cataſtrophe, for the purpoſe of encouraging the continuance of the preſent barbarous diſorders, ſo gently repreſented by you, as *the exertions of the ſpirit of political reformation, operating for liberty in moſt inſtances!* as *exertions in the cauſe of liberty againſt tyranny!* by

the

the example of the glorious exploits of the anceſtors of the preſent Romiſh banditti in the ſame cauſe with the preſent.

It is not a little remarkable, that the deſigns of the leaders of that rebellion were the ſame with yours, the ſeparation of this kingdom from England, and the eſtabliſhment of an independent government here; and with that view, and as the ſure means of effecting their purpoſe, they intended the utter extirpation of the Proteſtant religion, and had projected a reform in parliament by the deſtruction of the boroughs ſome time before they broke out into open rebellion, as may be ſeen by the hiſtories of that time, and particularly by that moſt valuable one, Mr. Carte's hiſtory of the Duke of Ormond, and the authentic documents which he has publiſhed in the appendix to it.

You begin your juſtification of the Iriſh rebellion with a falſe and acrimonious invective againſt king James the firſt. (I ſhall before I conclude this anſwer, expoſe your malignant miſtatement of the conduct of that prince to his Iriſh ſubjects.) You then proceed to abuſe, by moſt malicious miſrepreſentations, (to which you have ſo habituated yourſelf, that they ſeem to be natural to you,) the whole of the conduct of king Charles the firſt, and the adminiſtration of the Earl of Strafford, his miniſter in Ireland. It is no wonder that you, who preſume with an aſſurance peculiar to yourſelf to miſrepreſent in the moſt flagrant manner what is every day happening before our eyes, ſhould miſrepreſent antiquity without quoting any hiſtorian to ſupport your miſſtatements. You ſometimes add to your malignant fables the words, "*ſays the hiſtorian;*" pray, why did you not declare the hiſtorian's name? Such miſrepreſentations of tranſactions in the reigns of James the firſt, and Charles the firſt, but not tinged quite ſo deeply with acrimonious invective, are contained in two books, both of them of modern date; one written by a mercenary profligate ſcribbler, of the name of Brooke, hired by a club of Iriſh Romaniſts to defame the Proteſtant government of Ireland, and called *the trial of the Roman Catholics;* the other by a bigotted Romiſh phyſician of the city of Dublin, of the name of Curry, ſtiled,

an

an hiſtorical review of the wars of Ireland, a ſecond edition of this laſt treatiſe has been lately publiſhed in the city of Dublin by your *energetic* Romaniſts. Is the hiſtorian you allude to, but whom you decline to name, one of theſe? They both are in ſtile and credit, as hiſtorians, rather below the level of Oldmixon and Ogilby in England. Any perſon who wiſhes to be convinced of the falſe colouring with which they and you have diſguiſed and deformed the hiſtory of thoſe times, will be fully ſatisfied by reading the three firſt books of the firſt volume of Carte's hiſtory of the Duke of Ormond, and the authorities there referred to; and Hume, 6th vol. page 401, 402, &c. he will there find your calumnies fully refuted, and that Ireland owes her conſtitution, her laws, her manufactures, her trade, her civilization, to the two monarchs, and the great ſtateſman, you have thus baſely traduced and abuſed; that from a woody deſert, inhabited only by ſavage barbarians for the moſt part, it aſſumed the appearance of a civilized country by the great care and attention of theſe monarchs and their miniſters, particularly the Earl of Strafford. Hiſtory gives the following account of the Earl of Strafford's adminiſtration in Ireland: "In the government of Ireland, his ad-
"miniſtration had been equally promotive of his maſter's
"intereſt, and that of the ſubjects committed to his care;
"a large debt he had paid off; he had left a conſiderable
"ſum in the Exchequer; the revenues, which never before
"anſwered the charges of government, were now raiſed to
"be equal to them; a ſmall ſtanding army, formerly kept
"in no order, was augmented, and was governed by exact
"diſcipline; and a great force was then raiſed and paid for
"the ſupport of the king's authority againſt the Scotch co-
"venanters.

"Induſtry and all the arts of peace were introduced
"among that rude people; the ſhipping of the kingdom
"augmented a hundred fold; the cuſtoms tripled upon the
"ſame rates; the exports doubled in value to the imports;
"manufactures, particularly that of linen, introduced and
"promoted; agriculture, by means of the Engliſh and

"Scottiſh

" Scottiſh plantations, gradually advancing; the Proteſtant " religion encouraged without the perſecution or diſcontent " of the Catholics." See Hume's hiſtory, vol. 6th, page 402, and the authorities there quoted.

Remarks on Mr. Grattan's groſs abuſe of the Earl of Strafford.

As you have raked up the aſhes of the dead for the purpoſe of defaming them, and thereby juſtifying rebellion and maſſacre; it may not be amiſs here to inſert an account of the conduct of the Earl of Strafford, when brought to trial before his peers by mercileſs cruel republicans, who hunted him to death, and murdered him in defiance and contempt of the known laws of this country; though you, with as much ignorance as malice, ſtate that he "*juſtly loſt his head*;" as if the putting any man to death by a public execution, againſt whom no crime, which could warrant judgment of death by the known laws of the land, was proved, and againſt whom no judgment was pronounced by his peers who tried him, was an act of juſtice; eighty peers attended at his trial on an impeachment for high treaſon by the Commons. After the trial had laſted eighteen days, the managers of the Commons, finding they had failed in the proof of any act of treaſon againſt him, and that the peers intended to acquit him, immediately ſuſpended the progreſs of the trial; the Commons his accuſers turned judges, contrary to all law and juſtice, brought in and paſſed a bill of attainder againſt him in their own houſe, ſent it to the lords, compelled a majority of the lords, by great and outrageous mobs, and menaces of aſſaſſination, to paſs the bill; forty-five lords only, out of eighty that attended the trial, being preſent in the houſe at the time the bill paſſed; the reſt being kept away through dread of republican violence; and of theſe forty-five, nineteen voted againſt the bill. His majeſty was prevailed upon by a forged letter, pretended to have been written by the Earl himſelf, to give his aſſent to this murderous act; ſuch was the juſtice by which the Earl of Strafford loſt his head! it is modern French juſtice! I am not aſhamed to quote my hiſtorical authorities, ſee the State Trials, 1ſt vol. Hume, 6th vol from p. 400 to 411. Carte's Ormond, 1ſt vol. p. 131 to 136. Mr. Whitlock, the famous republican, favourite

vourite of Cromwell, and author of the memorials, was himſelf chairman of the committee of the Houſe of Commons, appointed to conduct and manage the impeachment againſt the earl before the lords; he thus deſcribes the behaviour of that great man on his trial: "Certainly never "any man acted ſuch a part on ſuch a theatre, with more "wiſdom, conſtancy and eloquence, with greater reaſon, "judgment, and temper, and with a better grace in all his "words and actions, than did this *great* and *excellent* per-"ſon, and he moved the hearts of all his auditors, ſome "few excepted, to *remorſe* and pity." And the ſame author, ſpeaking of the earl's death, thus expreſſes himſelf: "He died with charity, courage, and general lamentation. "Thus fell this noble earl, who for natural parts and abili-"ties, and for improvement of knowledge, by experience "in the greateſt affairs, for wiſdom, *faithfulneſs and gallan-"try* of mind, hath left few behind him, that may be rank-"ed equal with him." See Whitlock's memorials from p. 40 to 43. Such was the language of one of the proſecutors of that great and unfortunate ſtateſman reſpecting him; how different from that of you, his poſthumous defamer! who ſtile him with as much falſehood and malice, as vulgarity, a *robber*.

Remarks on Mr. Grattan's juſtification of the barbarous Roman maſſacre of 1641.

After your ſtating, contrary to all truth, to all authentic hiſtory, that the Iriſh were, before the rebellion and maſſacre, the moſt oppreſſed nation on earth, that theſe oppreſſions were the natural effects of a borough parliament; that the inhuman perſecutions under which the Iriſh then laboured were provocations ſufficient to excite in the minds of the people ſentiments of the moſt ſavage revenge, and fully to juſtify them; you break out into the following rant: "*Maſſacre*, confuſion, civil war, religious fury followed "*naturally and of courſe*; here you ſee hatched and matured "the egg which produced the maſſacre, and all that brood "of mortal conſequences. The principles of *robbery* were "planted by the deputy (the Earl of Strafford, and the go-"vernment were ſurprized at the growth of popular pil-"lage; had the country been left to a ſtate of barbarous

" nature, ſhe could not have been ſo ſhattered and con-
" vulſed, as, when thus reduced to a ſtate of barbarous
" art." Thus you defend the juſtice of this horrible maſ-
ſacre; for the man who tells us, that the provocation given
was ſuch as called for the revenge, juſtifies the revenge, it
then becomes but juſtice; homicide is even juſtifiable by the
common law, if the provocation is ſo great that human nature
cannot brook it, a robber may be juſtly ſlain by the party at-
tacked, ſuch homicide is delf-defence; here then you addreſs
the citizens of Dublin with a defence of the barbarous maſſacre
of their unoffending Proteſtant anceſtors by mercileſs Romiſh
murderers. Gracious God! a century and an half has paſſed
ſince that horrid tranſaction, and no man has, in all that time
been found audacious and wicked enough to juſtify it, except
yourſelf; many have attempted to extenuate it, ſome partially
to excuſe it, but no one fully to juſtify it, until you took up
your pen for that purpoſe; to awaken the horror in the minds
of Iriſh Proteſtants, which ſuch an attempt muſt juſtly
excite, I ſhall delineate from authentic hiſtorians ſome of
the moſt prominent and terrible features of that dreadful
cataſtrophe.

" *The Iriſh, every where intermingled with the Engliſh,*
" *needed but a hint from their leaders and prieſts to begin hoſ-*
" *tilities againſt a people whom they hated on account of their re-*
" *ligion, and envied for their riches and proſperity, the houſes,*
" *cattle, goods of the unwary Engliſh were firſt ſeized, theſe*
" *who heard of the commotions in their neighbourhood, inſtead of*
" *deſerting their habitations and aſſembling together for mutual*
" *protection, remained at home in hopes of defending their pro-*
" *perty, and fell thus ſeparately into the hands of their enemies,*
" *after rapacity had fully exerted itſelf, cruelty, and that the*
" *moſt barbarous, that ever in any natian, was known or heard*
" *of, began its operations, an univerſal maſſacre commenced of*
" *the Engliſh now defenceleſs and paſſively reſigned to their in-*
" *human foes, no age, no ſex, no condition was ſpared. The wife*
" *weeping for her butchered huſband, and embracing her helpleſs*
" *children, was pierced with them, and periſhed by the ſame*
" *ſtroke, the old, the young, the vigorous, the infirm, underwent*

" *the*

" *the like fate, and were confounded in one common ruin; in* " *vain did flight save from the first assault, destruction was* " *every where let loose, and met the hunted victims at every* " *turn; in vain was recourse had to relations, to companions,* " *to friends; all connexions were dissolved, and death was dealt* " *by that hand, from which protection was implored and ex-* " *pected; without provocation, without opposition, the astonished* " *English, being in profound peace and full security, were mas-* " *sacred by their nearest neighbours, with whom they had long* " *upheld a continued intercourse of kindness and good offices, but* " *death was the lightest punishment inflicted by those enraged* " *rebels; all the tortures which wanton cruelty could devise, all* " *the lingering pains of body, the anguish of mind, the agonies of* " *despair, could not satiate revenge, excited without injury, and* " *cruelty derived from no cause; to enter into the particulars* " *would shock the least delicate humanity, such enormities, though* " *attested by undoubted evidence, appear almost incredible, de-* " *praved nature, even perverted religion encouraged by the ut-* " *most licence, reaches not to such a pitch of ferocity, unless the* " *pity inherent in human breasts, be destroyed, by that contagion* " *of example, which transports man beyond all the usual motives* " *of conduct and behaviour.*

" *The weaker sex themselves, naturally tender to their own* " *sufferings and compassionate to those of others, here emulated* " *their more robust companions, in the practice of every cruelty;* " *even children, taught by the example, and encouraged by the ex-* " *hortation of their parents, essayed their feeble blows on the* " *dead carcases or defenceless children of the English; the very* " *avarice of the Irish was not a sufficient restraint to their cruel-* " *ty, such was their frenzy, that the cattle which they had seized,* " *and by rapine had made their own, yet because they bore the* " *name of English, were wantonly slaughtered, or when covered* " *with wounds, turned loose into the woods and deserts.*

" *The stately buildings or commodious habitations of the plan-* " *ters, as if upbraiding the sloth and ignorance of the natives,* " *were consumed with fire, or laid level with the ground, and* " *where the miserable owners, shut up in their houses and pre-* " *paring for defence perished in the flames, together with their*

" *wives and children, a double triumph was offered to their in-*
" *fulting foes.*

" *If any where a number aſſembled together, and aſſuming*
" *courage from deſpair, were reſolved to ſweeten death by a re-*
" *venge on their aſſaſſins, they were diſarmed by capitulations*
" *and promiſes of ſafety, confirmed by the moſt ſolemn oaths; but*
" *no ſooner had they ſurrendered, than the rebels, with perfidy*
" *equal to their cruelty, made them ſhare the fate of their un-*
" *happy countrymen.*

" *Others, more ingenious ſtill in their barbarity, tempted their*
" *priſoners, by the fond love of life, to embrue their hands in the*
" *blood of their friends, brothers, and parents, and having thus*
" *rendered them accomplices in guilt, gave them that death, which*
" *they ſought to ſhun by deſerving it.*

" *Amidſt all theſe enormities, the ſacred name of religion ſound-*
" *ed on every ſide, not to ſtop the hands of theſe murderers, but*
" *to enforce their blows, and to ſteel their hearts againſt every*
" *movement of human or ſocial ſympathy; the Engliſh, as here-*
" *tics, abhorred of God, and deteſtable to all holy men, were*
" *marked out by the prieſts for ſlaughter; and of all actions, to*
" *rid the world of theſe declared enemies to Catholic faith and*
" *piety, was repreſented as the moſt meritorious; nature, which*
" *in that rude people was ſufficiently inclined to atrocious deeds,*
" *was further ſtimulated by precept, and national prejudices em-*
" *poiſoned by thoſe averſions, more deadly and incurable, which*
" *aroſe from an enraged ſuperſtition, while death finiſhed the*
" *ſufferings of each victim, the bigotted aſſaſſins, with joy and*
" *exultation, ſtill echoed in his expiring ears, that theſe agonies*
" *were but the commencement of torments infinite and eternal.*"

Such is the deſcription of this helliſh maſſacre given by Mr. Hume in the 6th vol. of his hiſtory from page 410 to 436, and he ſtiles it, *an event memorable in the annals of human kind, and worthy to be held in perpetual deteſtation and abhorrence.* That he has not heightened the picture beyond reality, the writings of Temple, of Clarendon, of Ruſhworth, of Whitlock, cotemporary hiſtorians, and volumes of original depoſitions taken on the occaſion, and now extant in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, ſufficiently prove; ſome differences

ences of opinion have indeed prevailed, reſpecting the number of the immolated victims; Mr. Carte, a writer of ſingular humanity and juſtice, examines thoſe opinions reſpecting the number with great candour, and in the hiſtory of the Duke of Ormond, 1ſt vol. p. 177, 178, ſtates that though ſome writers had ſwelled the amount of the murdered to upwards of one hundred thouſand, yet that Peter Walſh, a Romiſh fryar, calculated the number ſlaughtered to amount to eight thouſand only; but that Sir William Petty in his Political Anatomy of Ireland, computed the number of Proteſtants maſſacred in cold blood, in the firſt year of the Iriſh rebellion, to amount to thirty-ſeven thouſand, and to this laſt calculation, Mr. Carte gives his own approbation, founded on the known abilities of Sir William Petty, his ſkill in calculation, and the opportunities he had of obtaining authentic information, he having, ſhortly after this dreadful period, ſurveyed the whole kingdom. It is here to be remarked that in Mr. Hume's account Engliſhman and Proteſtant are ſynonimous, the native Iriſh Romaniſts to this day counting every Proteſtant, though of Iriſh name and family, an Engliſhman, and having, as I have already obſerved, but one word in their language to ſignify both. Did you mean to inſult the citizens of Dublin by juſtifying this horrid maſſacre, as a juſt retaliation on the Iriſh Proteſtants, as oppreſſors of the Iriſh nation? What opinion do you think the citizens of Dublin will entertain of the heart of the man, who could juſtify ſo barbarous a tranſaction? Surely every Proteſtant in the nation, and every Romaniſt too, who is not one of *your energetics*, will hold the ſame opinion of its advocate, as Mr. Hume held of the event itſelf, to wit, that he is worthy to be held in perpetual deteſtation and abhorrence!

I have cited this hiſtorical account of the Iriſh maſſacre in the words of the hiſtorian, without adding one tittle to it, not with a view of awakening old animoſities, and exciting to new outrages, the purpoſe for which you lugged it head and ſhoulders into your addreſs.

I am perfectly convinced that many, I hope and believe a great majority, of the Iriſh Romaniſts of the preſent day, hold

hold it in as much abhorrence as I do, but I have taken this notice of it, becauſe you have provoked it; and to hold you up in your proper colours to the nation, which you have inſulted by juſtifying it, to ſhew the reaſonable Romaniſts, (for I write not to your *energetics*) to what barbarous and dangerous extremities you are urging them, merely for the gratification of your own ambition, and avarice; and to diſſect and expoſe to public inſpection, the heart of a man, capable of publiſhing to the world his approbation of the barbarous Iriſh maſſacre, and of the preſent horrible nocturnal murders, conflagrations, and robberies, perpetrated by your *popular and energetic Romaniſts*, throughout a great part of this nation, exactly of the ſame kind with thoſe perpetrated by the Iriſh rebels in the year 1641, and which you emphatically ſtile, *the exertions of the ſpirit of political reformation, operating for liberty in moſt inſtances*, and which in your addreſs you ſtimulate them to, as well by your avowed approbation of former maſſacres, as by telling them, that the exertions of the preſent government, in ſtationing and employing the king's army in different parts of the nation, for the ſuppreſſion of theſe murders and robberies, and the protection of the loyal and peaceable ſubjects, under the guidance of the civil magiſtrates, are murders, and the miniſter a murderer, and employer of murderers; thus you call the energetic Romaniſts, to arms! thus you ſound the trumpet of inſurrection and maſſacre, by the moſt notorious and malignant falſehoods! "The miniſter (you exclaim) deſtroyed liberty, and property, "he conſumed the preſs, he burned houſes and villages, "he *murdered* and he failed (that is, my brave confederates, "he has not yet been able to ſuppreſs the murders, and rob-"beries of you the *energetic Romaniſts*) recall your murder-"er, we ſaid, and in his place, diſpatch our meſſenger, try "conciliation," that is, baniſh your magiſtracy, recall the army, who are ſub-murderers, from the country, extinguiſh all law, abandon the loyal and peaceable Iriſh Proteſtant ſubjects, to murder, robbery and conflagration, give the kingdom up without further conteſt to the *popular and energetic Romaniſts*, and ſubmit your throats to the knife, without further

ther ſtruggle; for *the maſs of the people, the Iriſh nation,* are determined to maſſacre you all, you are foreigners, *murderers,* and merit ſlaughter.

I cannot yet diſmiſs your anſwer to the addreſs of the Romaniſts aſſembled at Francis-ſtreet Chapel without one further remark as well on your vanity, as your deceit: you mention therein during the very ſhort government of Earl Fitzwilliam that, "we" (meaning yourſelf and your puny faction of ten or twelve members in the Houſe of Commons) "obtained a great force and a great ſupply with the conſent "and confidence of the people;" and you add, "it is no "proof of wiſdom to take the taxes and continue the abuſes, "to daſh away the affection of the people of Ireland, to ſelect the moment when the people of Ireland came forward "with her blood and treaſure, reſolute to ſtand or fall with "the Britiſh nation, to plant a dagger in her heart." Theſe paragraphs are a continued chain of deceit; 1ſt, you intended to inſinuate, that by your influence, and that of your party in the Houſe of Commons, a large ſupply was procured in the lieutenancy of Earl Fitzwilliam, and a conſiderable increaſe of troops voted; do you think any man in Ireland, can be impoſed upon by ſuch legerdemain? The exertions and influence of you and your party, could not have added or deducted, one ſhilling, to, or from, the ſupply; nor one man to, or from, the number of troops voted; you might indeed have retarded the ſupply, perhaps for a couple of days, by your frothy harangues, and you might by ſuch means, have detained the members of the Houſe of Commons for a night or two to late hours; the impotence of you, and your party in the Houſe, is ſo well known, that your boaſt of having obtained a great force and a great ſupply, inſtead of procuring you any credit, only excites laughter at your extravagant vanity, in thoſe who know, and conſider only your imbecility; a ſneer of contempt at your deceit, in thoſe who know you intended this part of your anſwer to the addreſs, for the inſpection of the Engliſh Jacobins, your maſters, to induce them to believe that you are of great weight and conſequence in the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, and might, if you had

thought

thought proper, have defeated or diminiſhed the ſupply; and a ſtare of ſurpriſe in all, at your impudence, in openly publiſhing in Ireland, what every man in Ireland, who has ever adverted to public affairs, knows to be a falſehood. Secondly, you intended to inſinuate, that you and your friends procured an ample ſupply, and an additional number of troops on the terms expreſs or implied, that government ſhould exert all its intereſt to cauſe your bill for what you ſtile *Catholic emancipation*, to be enacted into a law, and that the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam was a breach of the terms, and a ſtab to the heart of the nation; but it is evident no ſuch terms could have been agreed upon, becauſe the whole nation knew that you and your friends could neither procure the grant or the denial of a ſupply. therefore no terms could have been made with you or them, on that ſcore; it is indeed certain enough that Earl Fitzwilliam, or rather you his governor, did determine to exert all the intereſt and power of government to cauſe that bill to paſs into a law, and that ſuch exertion of that intereſt was defeated by the ſudden recall of Earl Fitzwilliam, but that his recall, and the defeat of ſuch a bill, were conſidered by the *nation* as a *national* calamity, as a ſtab to the heart of the nation, and as a ſignal inſtance of ingratitude, after ample ſupplies had been voted by the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, is a falſehood as groundleſs as any other contained in your addreſs; for every Proteſtant in the nation, except ſome uſurpers of that name, the diſciples of Paine, Price, and Prieſtley, ſhewed every demonſtration of joy on the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam, that is, a body of the Iriſh people poſſeſſing forty-nine parts out of fifty of the landed property of Ireland, and at leaſt nineteen parts out of twenty, of the perſonal property, the great landed and moneyed intereſt of the kingdom; and as to the bill for what you fraudulently ſtile the *emancipation of the Roman Catholics*, you informed *your popular and energetic Romaniſts*, your committee of nine, in your anſwer to the addreſs of them and their mob, that you meant with *their permiſſion* to introduce their bill, immediately after the receſs, which took place on the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam, which permiſſion that moſt reſpectable committee of nine,

compoſed

compoſed of traders, ſhopkeepers, and empirics, by their reſolution of the 9th of April 1795, moſt graciouſly conceded to you: after the playing of this farce, between you and this doughty committee, you introduced this bill into the Houſe of Commons out of which it was ſcouted by an immenſe majority of the Houſe, you and about twenty more, only, ſupporting it; what proof then have you of the truth of your aſſertions that the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam, was a ſtab to the heart of the nation, and a mark of the blackeſt ingratitude to the *nation*, which had granted ample ſupplies? almoſt the whole body of the landed and moneyed intereſt of the nation, manifeſted the utmoſt joy on the recall of that nobleman, and the ſame Houſe of Commons, which had granted the ſupplies, almoſt unanimouſly ſcouted out your emancipation bill, the favourite meaſure of that nobleman and thoſe employed by him; in ſhort, it is plain, that in your anſwer you mean fraudulently to impoſe your Romaniſt committee, and their mob, your *popular and energetic Romaniſts*, on your Jacobin maſters in England, as the Iriſh nation, the Iriſh people; ſo much for your anſwer to the addreſs of the *popular and energetic Romaniſts* aſſembled in Francis-ſtreet Chapel.

Proceedings of the Romiſh aſſembly at Francis-ſtreet Chapel on the 9th of April 1795, their public declarations of their republican principles, and their determined hoſtility to Great Britain; and their recognition of Mr. Tone, a French ſpy, as one of their agents, as well as Mr. Grattan.

The Romiſh committee having by your advice diſpatched three delegates to the Britiſh court, as ambaſſadors with a remonſtrance, which they preſented to his majeſty at his levee, againſt the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam, and being there received with all the contempt, which the preſumption and abſurdity of their miſſion merited, returned to Ireland and ſummoned another meeting of their party, at the Romiſh Chapel in Francis-ſtreet on the 9th of April 1795, four members of your committee of nine here diſplayed their oratorical abilities; as they were all known to be your puppets, and to act under your control, and inſtructions, a ſhort account of the proceedings of this aſſembly and of the tendency of their ſpeeches will ſerve more clearly to illuſtrate your dangerous projects; one principal object with this aſſembly, was, to impoſe a belief on the Iriſh Proteſtants remote from Dublin, that the pretenſions of theſe *popular and energetic Romaniſts*, were favoured by the body of the Proteſtants of Dublin, and to

to give a countenance to this fraud, a few Romiſh ſtudents of Trinity College, Dublin, (Romaniſts having been ſhortly before enabled by act of parliament to receive their education in that ſeminary) repaired to that aſſembly; their appearance at the Romiſh Chapel was pre-concerted, they were received with great acclamation, and one of the orators welcomed them in a moſt bombaſtic addreſs; he affected, as did the reſt of the aſſembly, to treat them as if they were the whole of the Proteſtant ſtudents of the College of Dublin, although all the aſſembly knew the contrary; many of theſe young men being the children of leading Romaniſts then preſent, and they were part of a body, who had on that day preſented a fulſome addreſs to you, and were then returning after perfuming your idolſhip with their incenſe; two of theſe Romiſh ſtudents in their turn harangued the aſſembly, and inveighed with all the bitterneſs of the moſt malignant Romiſh natives, againſt all connexions between Great Britain and Ireland; they appeared to be perfectly well tutored in all the rebellious doctrine of ſeparation of this country from Britain; in all the Romiſh publications of the tranſactions of this aſſembly, the attendance of this handful of ſtudents is blazoned forth, as if it was the attendance of all the members of the Proteſtant Univerſity of Dublin; the ſpeeches uttered at this aſſembly were publiſhed in moſt of the daily papers in Dublin, and were carefully copied into Jacobin Newſpapers in London; one orator, of the name of M'Nevin,* one of the committee of nine, after repreſenting Great Britain as almoſt totally ſubdued by the arms of France, adviſes the Romaniſts immediately, and during the war, to commence all kind of hoſtilities againſt Britain, and thus declaims, "what may we "not expect from the madneſs of her returning proſperity, "when amidſt the *wreck of all her greatneſs*, by a treatment "equally irritating and unjuſt, ſhe ſeems to ſolicit inſurrec-

"tion

* This is the M'Nevin, who was, after this tranſaction, diſpatched by the United Iriſhmen, to treat with the French Directory, and induce them to invade Ireland. On confeſſion of his treaſons, his life has been ſpared; he is now a Priſoner at Fort George in Scotland, and was one of the committee of nine.

" tion among the people, or to command a dereliction of " their rights!" Throughout all their ſpeeches, theſe Romiſh orators affect to take it as granted, that what they call Catholic emancipation, is the wiſh of all the people of Ireland, that the Proteſtants of Ireland are attached friends to their pretenſions, or too inconſiderable to be at all conſidered in the diſcuſſion of them, and that they are only oppoſed by the Britiſh miniſtry; ſuch deception they think may have weight in England, where the falſehood, the utter contempt of truth, the meanneſs, poverty and impotence of the declaimers are unknown, but they well know, that they and their aſſertions, are treated with due contempt in Ireland.

The ſame orator proceeds thus: " It is the protection of " England, which has taken away your regular army to be " employed in her *impious cruſade*, her protection has not left " you a port from Bilboa to the Baltick, and involved you " in a war, in which had ſhe been ſucceſsful, *had not the* " *judgment of God overtaken her*, ſhe would have the power, " and I doubt not, the inclination, to rivet your bolts for " ever, her protection has been well compared to that of the " exalted oak in the thunder ſtorm; to the unphiloſophic " clown who ſeeks its ſhade, the tree ſerves to conduct more " unerringly the lightning's force upon his head; the mo- " ment is at hand, when the world ſhall know how to eſti- " mate the connexion of both countries, and the independ- " ence of our ſtate; the problem will be now reſolved, " whether Ireland be a free and *imperial* nation, or only an " out-lying province to Great Britain."

All theſe orators magnified the general population of Ireland, and the exceſs of the number of Romaniſts, over that of the Proteſtants in it, beyond all bounds of truth and probability; and further to excite rebellion, they diminiſhed the population of Britain in the ſame degree, and deſcanted throughout, on defeats and diſcomfitures of the Britiſh arms, which never happened, and they all in the moſt violent terms reprobated all ideas of an union with Great Britain, and urged the neceſſity of a parliamentary reform.

Another

Another of theſe orators of the name of Ryan, a member of the committee of nine, endeavoured in his harangue, to perſuade ſuch of his audience as had taken the oath enjoined to be taken by the act of 1793 by all Romaniſts who were deſirous of having the benefit of that act, that nothing contained in that oath, could prevent them from endeavouring to overthrow the preſent Proteſtant Church eſtabliſhment in Ireland—The clauſe in the oath relating to the church eſtabliſhment is as follows:

" And I do hereby diſclaim, diſavow, and ſolemnly abjure " any intention to ſubvert the preſent church eſtabliſhment, " for the purpoſe of ſubſtituting a Catholic eſtabliſhment in its " ſtead."

The argument of the laſt mentioned orator, is thus: " You have not abſolutely ſworn, that you will not endeavour to ſubvert the preſent Proteſtant Church eſtabliſhment; you have only ſworn that you will not endeavour to ſubvert it, for the purpoſe of ſubſtituting a Romiſh Church eſtabliſhment in its room; but notwithſtanding this oath, you may ſubvert the preſent Proteſtant Church eſtabliſhment, provided you do not ſubſtitute a Romiſh eſtabliſhment in its room; now when we ſubvert the preſent, we will live without any eſtabliſhment, and we will not ſubſtitute a Romiſh eſtabliſhment in the room of that ſubverted:" his words on this occaſion are remarkable, " and I will ſay, that I have " reaſon to think that Catholics, ſo far from being willing " to ſubvert one eſtabliſhment, *in order to ſubſtitute their own* " *in its place*, would not, if all eſtabliſhments were levelled " to the ground, deſire or conſent to build up an excluſive " eſtabliſhment for their own clergy and their own creeds."—

This aſſembly then came to ſeveral reſolutions, ſome of them I ſhall inſert.

" Reſolved unanimouſly, that we are ſincerely and unal- " terably attached, to the rights, liberties, and *independence* " of our native country, and we pledge ourſelves, *collectively* " and *individually*, to reſiſt, even our own emancipation—if " propoſed to be conceded on the ignominious terms of an " acquieſcence, in the fatal meaſure of *an union*, with the " ſiſter kingdom."

" Reſolved

" Reſolved unanimouſly, that the right hon. Henry Grat-
" tan be requeſted to introduce the Catholic bill, immedi-
" ately on the meeting of parliament."

" Reſolved unanimouſly, that the thanks of this meeting
" be reſpectfully preſented to our agent, *Theobald Wolfe Tone*,
" *Eſq.* for the readineſs with which he accompanied our de-
" puties to England, and the many other *important ſervices*,
" he has rendered to the Catholic body in purſuit of emanci-
" pation, *ſervices which no gratitude can overrate, and no re-*
" *muneration can overpay.*"

Before I proceed further in detailing the conduct of you, and your confederates, the *popular and energetic Romaniſts*, it is neceſſary for me to explain, not to you, but to the public, who this Mr. Tone, your fellow agent for the Romiſh committee of nine, is, and what his public conduct has been; as ſuch explanation, will ſtrongly tend to illuſtrate your conduct in ſome particulars, and to clear away all doubts reſpecting your real deſigns.

This Mr. Tone* is the ſon of a mechanic of ſome ſort in Dublin, who found means to procure him an education in the College of Dublin, and he afterwards made his way to the bar; he formed that ſociety of aſſaſſins, the United Iriſhmen; his name has often appeared as ſecretary to that pack of blood-hounds; in 1792 he publiſhed a pamphlet, entitled, An argument on behalf of the Catholics of Ireland; the object of it is to ſhew the *deplorable ſtate* of Ireland, ariſing from her *connexion with Great Britain*, to prove that the emancipation of the Romaniſts, by their admiſſion into the legiſlature will be followed neceſſarily by a *parliamentary reform*, and that ſuch *reform*, produced by ſuch means, will enable Ireland to exiſt, as an independent ſtate perfectly ſevered from Great Britain; he ſtates that every hour brings forth to Ireland

Account of Mr. Tone.

* Since the firſt publication of this anſwer, Tone was apprehended on board the Hoche French man of War, taken by Sir John Borlaſe Warren, on the coaſt of Ireland, with troops on board for the invaſion of Ireland. He was in a French uniform, and alleged that he was an adjutant-general in the French army. He was tried, and condemned to be hanged and quartered for High Treaſon; the morning of the day, appointed for his execution, he cut his own throat, and thus defrauded the gallows. His brother was taken with Humbert, the French general, and hanged.

Ireland infinite reſources and provocations to independence, he laviſhes the higheſt praiſes on the national aſſembly of France, deſcribing them, " as a body of repreſentatives, not " of their conſtituents merely, but of man, whoſe nature " they have exalted beyond the limits, that even Providence " ſeemed to have bounded it by;" he cloſes his pamphlet, by an addreſs to the people of Ireland, in theſe words, " *let* " *them once cry reform, and the Catholics of Ireland are free,* " *independent, and happy.*"

This pamphlet recommended Mr. Tone to your committee of nine, your *popular and energetic Romaniſts*, they employed him as your co-adjutor in emancipation, and voted him the ſum of fifteen hundred pounds for his trouble.

A man of the name of Jackſon was ſent over to Ireland in the beginning of the year 1794, by the French convention, as a ſpy, to procure them intelligence of the ſtate of Ireland, the diſpoſition of the inhabitants, and the practicability of an invaſion; Mr. Hamilton Rowan, and Doctor Reynolds, both of them now exiles, outlawed for high treaſon, and Mr. Tone, now an exile too, immediately on the arrival of the French ſpy, formed a ſtrict connexion with him; Rowan was introduced to him by a man of the name of Lewins,* one of the orators at this aſſembly in Francis-ſtreet Chapel of the 9th of April 1795, a remarkable Romiſh agitator; Tone being a man of letters and a barriſter, was fixed on by the French ſpy, to draw up a ſtate of Ireland to be tranſmitted to the French convention, to encourage them to invade the kingdom; this buſineſs Mr. Tone, co-agent with you for the Iriſh Romaniſts, performed in April 1794. Jackſon was arreſted by the government in the ſame month, and after putting off his trial by affidavits, once or twice, he was at length tried, and convicted of high treaſon, at the bar of the court of King's Bench, on the 23d of April 1795, and being brought up to receive ſentence on the 30th of that month, he died at the bar, having previouſly ſwallowed poiſon; his aforeſaid aſſociates made their eſcapes; on this trial, the paper drawn up by

* Since the firſt publication of this anſwer, Lewins was diſpatched to France by the United Iriſhmen, and is now their accredited agent, with the French Directory.

by Tone, as a ſtate of this nation, for the uſe of the French convention, was read in evidence, having been intercepted at the poſt-office; in this paper, this co-agent with you for the Iriſh Romaniſts, groſsly miſtates the relative numbers of inhabitants of different ſects; he reduces the Proteſtants of the eſtabliſhed church to one half their number, he more than doubles the number of Proteſtant diſſenters, indeed he trebles it, and he adds at leaſt one-third to the number of Romaniſts; his reaſon for thus falſifying is obvious, he was a man of deſperate fortune, he was as firmly attached to the project of the ſeparation of this nation from Great Britain, as you, or the aſſembly at Francis-ſtreet Chapel, his and your employers; Mr. Tone's attachment to this project may be ſeen by his writings, and that of the aſſembly at Francis-ſtreet, by their ſpeeches, publiſhed by themſelves with great oſtentation, in which they publicly avow the doctrine of ſeparation: Mr. Tone very well knew, that the execution of ſuch a project, could not be even attempted with any reaſonable proſpect of ſucceſs, without the aid of an army of French aſſaſſins, and he was apprehenſive, if he ſtated the relative numbers of the inhabitants of Ireland of different ſects truly, that the French would decline the hazard of an expedition to Ireland: In reſpect however to the property, political opinions, and inclinations, of the different ſects, his ſtatement is more to be depended on, though not accurately true; it proceeds thus: "The Proteſtants of the eſtabliſhed church have "engroſſed, beſides the whole church patronage, all the pro- "fits and honors of the country excluſively, and a very great "ſhare of the landed property; the diſſenters are ſteady re- "publicans, devoted to liberty, and through all the ſtages "of the French revolution, have been enthuſiaſtically attach- "ed to it; the Catholics, the great body of the people, are "in the loweſt degree of ignorance, and are ready for any "change, becauſe no change can make them worſe; the "whole peaſantry may be ſaid to be Catholics, they are in a "ſemi-barbarous ſtate, which of all others is the beſt adapt- "ed for making war; *in Ireland the very name of England,* "*and her power is univerſally odious*, ſave with thoſe who have

Mr. Tone's ſtate of Ireland for the uſe of the French convention.

"an

" an intereſt in maintaining it, that is, with the Proteſtants " of the eſtabliſhment, who compoſe the parliament, and " grand juries, and are ariſtocrats, whoſe very tenantry, and " dependants would deſert and turn againſt them, on the " firſt convulſion, which would level them in the duſt ; the " diſſenters are enemies to the Engliſh power, from reaſon, " and from reflexion, *the Catholics from a hatred of the Engliſh* " *name, reſulting from the tyranny of near ſeven centuries*;" and he ſtates the ſame grievances which you have ſo often complained of, to wit, " the church eſtabliſhment, the payment " of tythes, the government proſecutions, the convention act, " the gun powder act, &c. &c." all which he repreſents, " as depreſſing public ſpirit, and as leaving no method for " the people to make their ſentiments known, but by war," that is, by open rebellion when the French army ſhall arrive, and by nocturnal murders and plunder, until that bleſſed period.—So far proceeded your co-agent for the Romaniſts, your fellow labourer in the vineyard of emancipation, in his treaſonable correſpondence with the enemy !

However heightened the colouring of this picture, drawn by the pencil of Mr. Tone, of the ſituation of this country, for the inſpection of the French convention, may be, the time of painting it, and ſeveral traits in it are very well worthy of notice ; at the very time he painted it, in April 1794, and for a long time before, he was the acknowledged agent, of the *popular and energetic Romaniſts*, the identical perſons who employed you ; and the oſtenſible employment of you both, was the work of what you and theſe Romaniſts fraudulently ſtile *emancipation* ; at that very time, it was notorious, that he had carried on, or attempted to carry on, a treaſonable correſpondence with the enemy, with the privity at leaſt of ſome of the Romaniſt orators, at this aſſembly of Francis-ſtreet Chapel, particularly a man of the name of Lewins, as has been proved on Jackſon's trial ; this aſſembly voted him as their agent, their thanks for many *important ſervices* he had rendered to the Catholic body, in purſuit of *emancipation*, ſervices as they deſcribe them, which *no gratitude*

titude can overrate, and no remuneration can overpay; they do not think fit to ſtate, what theſe ſervices were; your ſervices, or part of your ſervices, to theſe Romaniſts, were, your violent exertions in the Houſe of Commons in their favour, and your planning their ſeveral applications to parliament. Mr. Tone was not in parliament, and could not ſerve them that way; but Mr. Tone had written a pamphlet, in which he ſtrongly recommended a total ſeparation of this country from Great Britain, as the only method by which the Romaniſts could compleatly emancipate themſelves; and as ſuch ſeparation could not be effected by any other means, than by an army of French murderers, and as theſe *popular and energetic* Romaniſts, aſſembled at Francis-ſtreet Chapel, the employers both of you and him, have fairly, and unequivocally, expreſſed their approbation of ſeparation; it is by no means unreaſonable to conjecture, that Mr. Tone's correſpondence with the French convention, and his endeavours to induce them to ſend an army to invade this country, *were the important ſervices, which no gratitude can overrate, and no remuneration can overpay*, rendered by him to the Catholic body, in purſuit of emancipation, mentioned in their reſolution, but which they dared not openly avow, on account of their treaſonable nature. It is not a little remarkable, that Mr. Tone on this occaſion, repeats the ſame pretended grievances of the nation, which you have ſo often repeated, and alſo that he pointedly admits, that the only friends of the Britiſh connexion in the country, the only loyal ſubjects, the only decided enemies of the French revolution, and the people who poſſeſs almoſt the whole property of the country, are the Proteſtants of the eſtabliſhed church; he alſo pointedly admits, what has ſo often been objected againſt the Iriſh Romaniſts, and againſt their claims to political power, their inveterate and invincible hatred of the Engliſh name, nation, and empire; he alſo pointedly admits that the bulk of them are the peaſantry of Ireland, the moſt wretched in Europe, and that they are in a ſemi-barbarous ſtate; will you not admit, ſir, that Mr. Tone your co-adjutor, the acknowledged agent of the *popular*

and energetic Romaniſts (whom you every where and on every occaſion ſtate, to be repreſentatives of the whole maſs of the Iriſh Romaniſts, and their aſſembly, the only legitimate organ empowered to expreſs the ſentiments of that wholy body,) the man to whom that aſſembly had voted the ſum of fifteen hundred pounds at one time for his ſervices, and alſo their thanks in the moſt energetick manner; will you not, I ſay, admit that he knew this body, and their opinions, as well as you, and was as capable of forming a right judgment of them? and how ridiculous are your pathetic rants, about the hardſhip of the excluſion of Romaniſts, from about thirty of the great offices of the ſtate and from ſeats in the legiſlative body, that is, the excluſion of a body of ſubjects, of little property, and incurably diſaffected to the civil and religious eſtabliſhments, of the nation, (if their own agent, your worthy co-adjutor Mr. Tone, is to be believed,) from the legiſlative and ſuperior executive capacity!

Further to demonſtrate that your co-agent Mr. Tone, entertained the ſame project with yourſelf, the total ſeparation of the two nations, I ſhall give a ſhort extract from a letter of Mr. Tone, to a confidential correſpondent of his in the North of Ireland, engaged in the ſame conſpiracy, for raiſing a rebellion in this kingdom; this letter is publiſhed by the Secret Committee of the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, in their report of the 10th of May, 1797, and appears to have been written early in the year 1794, at which time it may be inferred from a paſſage in the letter, that you and Mr. Tone had no connexion, and when from his want of knowledge of you, he had great doubts, whether you or your party could be prevailed on to ſupport meaſures, which by your anſwer to the addreſs of the Romaniſts, on the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam, and by your preſent addreſs, it appears you have now very fully adopted, and which probably you had adopted before: the extract is as follows: "My unalterable opinion is, that the bane of Iriſh proſ-
" perity, is in the influence of England; I believe that influ-
" ence will ever be extended, while the *connexion* between the
" two

" two countries continues ;" then the letter, alluding to re-
" solutions contained in it, goes on thus, " nevertheleſs, as I
" know that opinion is for the preſent, too hardy, though a
" very little time may eſtabliſh it univerſally, I have not made
" it a part of the reſolutions; I have not ſaid one word, that
" looks like a wiſh for *ſeparation*, though I give it to you, and
" your friends, as my moſt decided opinion, that ſuch an event
" would be, a regeneration to this country." In the ſame letter Mr. Tone calls the *French Revolution* the *Morning Star* of liberty to Ireland.

You had not at the time this letter was written, publicly avowed your plan of emancipation, you were not at that time, in the honourable employment of co-agent, for the *popular* and *energetic* Romaniſts, with Mr. Tone, and therefore in this letter, he expreſſes ſome doubts of your political creed, which you have ſince very compleatly ſatisfied.

The reſolution of this aſſembly at Francis-ſtreet Chapel, expreſſive of the firm determination of the whole Romaniſt party there aſſembled, to reſiſt an union with Great Britain, and rather to relinquiſh their favourite meaſure of emancipation, than conſent to ſuch a meaſure, was not at all called for by any circumſtance relating to the oſtenſible cauſe of their meeting; it originated entirely in that inveterate hatred, which Mr. Tone, your colleague in the agency for the Romaniſts, aſſerts, that all Iriſh Romaniſts entertain of England, her natives and her power; and even their own intereſt could not prevent them from declaring it ſo far as they dared, though much out of time.

It has been the opinion of very great and able ſtateſmen, that an union with England, on juſt and equitable terms, would be very advantageous to Ireland, would contribute greatly to encreaſe her trade, and her opulence, and conduce to the ſtrength of the empire at large, and in any event, it could not be more prejudicial to the Romaniſts of Ireland, than to any other claſs of his majeſty's ſubjects here, but much leſs, (if it could be at all prejudicial, which I cannot admit) in as much, if we were one people with the Britiſh nation, the preponde-

rance of the Proteſtant body of the whole empire would be ſo great, that all rivalſhip and jealouſies, between Proteſtants and Romaniſts would ceaſe for ever, and it would not be neceſſary for the ſafety of the empire at large, to curb Romaniſts, by any excluſive laws whatſoever; but the immortal hatred of theſe *energetic* Romaniſts, to the Britiſh name, nation, and religion, and the annihilation of all their hopes of an independent Romiſh republic in Ireland, which they foreſaw would be the effect of an union, chaſed from their minds in a moment all ideas of reaſon, prudence, and intereſt, and induced them, without any neceſſity whatſoever, to expreſs their hoſtility to Britain; a conduct, which I hope will give the Britiſh miniſters proper ideas of the danger of countenancing any further innovations, in church or ſtate in Ireland, projected by you and your aſſociates, in favour of Iriſh Romaniſts.

The ſettled determination of your aſſociates and employers, the Romiſh committee of nine, and the *popular* and *energetic* Romaniſts, whom you ſtile the great body of the Catholics, and alſo of your colleague in the work of emancipation, Mr. Tone, being thus publiſhed and declared for the ſeparation of the two countries, and it being alſo avowed by him, that the obtaining of what they ſtile emancipation, and alſo parliamentary reform, was only conſidered by them as ancillary to ſeparation, and to the eſtabliſhment of an independent Romiſh republic in Ireland; and your colleague, thinking that the buſineſs could not be compleated without a rebellion at home, and the aid of a French army of invaders, and having accordingly ſolicited ſuch aid, I ſhall now quote a few paſſages from your addreſs to your fellow citizens of Dublin, to afford them ſome further aſſiſtance in judging, whether your opinions upon theſe projects, and the means of effecting them, are not the ſame with thoſe of your employers, *the popular and energetic Iriſh Romaniſts*, and of your colleague Mr. Tone; and whether all your proceedings, do not directly tend to the ſame point with thoſe of your aforeſaid colleague and employers

As to emancipation and reform, you have ſo publicly avowed that they are the object of your purſuit, both in and out of parliament, in all your ſpeeches and addreſſes, for theſe

two

two years paſt, that it is needleſs to quote any paſſage to prove that you have openly patronized the meaſures. As to ſeparation, which includes rebellion, and invaſion, you have obſerved ſome caution; you have thought it prudent to diſguiſe your opinion on this daring meaſure under a veil, but it is a veil of thin gauze, ſcarce ſufficient to cover you from legal proſecution, your view in uſing any diſguiſe at all.

Mr. Tone aſcribes the inveterate hatred of the Engliſh name and nation in the Iriſh Romaniſts, to the tyranny of the Engliſh government in Ireland, for near ſeven centuries; you do not go ſo far back; you begin your account of the horrible oppreſſion of the Iriſh, by the Engliſh government, with the reign of James the firſt; you then proceed to the reign of Charles the firſt, and juſtify and approve the horrible Iriſh maſſacre of that reign, as a meaſure of juſt reſiſtance and retaliation; you ſtate, that all the preſent nightly murders, robberies, and conflagrations, ariſe from the "ſpirit of public "reformation, carried to different degrees, to liberty in moſt "inſtances," you repreſent the miniſter, without ſpecifying who the Miniſter is, *as a murderer of the people*, notoriouſly meaning, that the government, that is, thoſe employed by the king in the different offices of it, are murderers of the people; you ſtate that peerages are ſold, conſequently that the Houſe of Peers is degraded, (this you aſſerted in parliament, you were called on for your proofs, you could produce none) you vilify in the baſeſt manner, the Houſe of Commons, calling it a *borough parliament*, meaning, I preſume, a borough *houſe* of parliament, as if all the members of it were members for boroughs only, and ſtating that all boroughs are venal, that the members for ſuch boroughs are not repreſentatives of the people, and that all their acts are groſs oppreſſions of the people. Thus you vilify, degrade, and traduce, king, lords, and commons, the whole conſtitutional ſupreme legiſlative and executive power of the nation, and tell the nation, that all acts of parliament, that have been enacted ſince the commencement of the reign of James the firſt, are wicked and unwarranted impoſitions, calculated to encourage and authorize

thorize the commiſſion of murder, rapine, and every ſpecies of oppreſſion on the Iriſh ſubjects, and " on the whole, " that the cauſe of the Iriſh diſtraction of 1797, was the " conduct of the ſervants of government, endeavouring to " eſtabliſh by unlimited bribery, abſolute power; that the " ſyſtem of co-ercion, was a neceſſary conſequence, and " part of the ſyſtem of corruption, and that the two ſyſtems, " in their ſucceſs, would have eſtabliſhed a ruthleſs and hor- " rid tyranny—tremendous and intolerable, impoſed on the " ſenate by influence, and the people by arms." You make the following eulogy, on the Iriſh peaſantry, by a part of whom, all the preſent nocturnal murders, and depredations, are committed, " to vindicate their native energy, againſt a " vulgar error, they are a ſtrong, hardy, bold, brave, labo- " rious warm-hearted and *faithful race of men.*" Some of them are certainly, very fit for the purpoſe of you and your colleague Mr. Tone, and are ſo far *faithful*, that it is difficult to prevail on them to impeach their accomplices.

You then proceed to your bead-roll of grievances, which you commence with enumerating certain inequalities in the trade, between Great Britain and Ireland, and cloſe it with the following grievances, " the bar bill—the convention bill " —the gunpowder bill—the indemnity bill—the ſecond in- " demnity bill—the inſurrection bill—the ſuſpenſion of the " habeas corpus—General Lake's proclamation, by order of " government—the approbation afforded to that proclama- " tion—the ſubſequent proclamation of government, more " military and deciſive—the order for the military to act " without waiting for the civil power—the impriſonment of " the middle orders without law—the detaining of them in " priſon without bringing them to trial—the tranſporting " them without law—burning their houſes—burning their " villages—murdering them; crimes many of which are " concealed, by the ſuppreſſion of a free preſs, by military " force—the preventing legal meetings of counties, to peti- " tion his majeſty, by orders acknowledged to be given to the " military, to diſperſe them; ſubverting the ſubjects right to " petition, and finally the introduction of practices, not only " unknown

Mr. Grattan's liſt of grievances, with remarks upon.

" unknown to law, but unknown to *civilized and chriſtian* " countries; ſuch has been the working of the borough " ſyſtem, nor could ſuch meaſures have taken place, but for " that ſyſtem."

As to your pretended grievances in reſpect to trade, they have been often introduced by you and your party in debate in the Houſe of Commons, where they have always met with a full and free diſcuſſion, and as far as I, who am no trader, nor much ſkilled in trade, have been able to judge, the matters of complaint, on the ſcore of trade, have been always ſuggeſted by a few ſmuggling merchants on this ſide of the water, aided by a few of their confederates in Liverpool, who had projected ſchemes of advantage to themſelves, and of damage to the fair traders, and the revenues both of England and Ireland, by an alteration in the rules of commerce eſtabliſhed between the two countries; and theſe matters of complaint were adopted, and foſtered with the greateſt care and attention, by you, your puny party in parliament, and *your popular and energetic Romaniſts*, with a view of ſowing the ſeeds of diſcord between the two countries; but all your propoſitions, reſpecting the inequality of trade between the two countries, ſince the free trade was eſtabliſhed, have been uniformly rejected by a very great and deciſive majority of the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, whom no reaſonable perſon will ſuppoſe, to be ſo blinded to the intereſt of the nation, and their own intereſt individually, as to reject your meaſures reſpecting trade, if they thought they would conduce to the increaſe of the wealth of the nation in general, and to that of their own tenantry and eſtates in particular. Your conduct in reſpect to laying what you termed protecting duties on Engliſh refined ſugar, imported into this kingdom, convinces me either of your ignorance of trade or ſomething worſe; for by the operation of this law, a few ſugar refiners in this kingdom, where that trade is a monopoly confined to about forty perſons, have made aſtoniſhing fortunes, in a ſhort period of time; particularly the preſident of your Romiſh convention, and of your ſtanding Romiſh committee, their gains being at leaſt eighty per cent. and the ſubjects of this kingdom pay on an average,

average, from ſix-pence to eight-pence per pound, for common lump ſugar, more than is paid in England for the ſame commodity, of an infinitely ſuperior quality; theſe protecting duties, and the conſequent plunder of the Iriſh ſubject by theſe inſatiable harpies the ſugar-refiners, were your job in parliament, and its effect.

The firſt act of parliament you reprobate, to wit, the bar bill, is a bill appointing aſſiſtant barriſters in the ſeveral counties, with ſmall ſalaries, for the purpoſe of deciding ſuits by civil bill, in a ſummary way, and trying perſons for ſmall offences, at the ſeſſions of the peace; all this buſineſs in Ireland fell under the cognizance of the judges of aſſize, at the two annual circuits; manor courts are very rare in Ireland; a great part of the buſineſs determined by civil bill in Ireland, is in England determined by the manor courts, which in that country are very numerous, and never falls under the cognizance of the judges of aſſize there; and it cannot be deemed any hardſhip on the ſubject, that country gentlemen acting as juſtices of peace, at a quarter ſeſſions or ſeſſions of the peace, ſhould be aſſiſted by a barriſter, having ſome knowledge of the profeſſion of the law; the judges of aſſize complained that the buſineſs at aſſizes was ſo increaſed, that they were not able to go through it, and for theſe reaſons, theſe aſſiſtant barriſters were appointed, in the ſeveral counties throughout the kingdom; ſuch appointments are the places complained of by you, as being created ſince the place-bill paſſed in parliament, which place-bill vacates the ſeat of any member of the Houſe of Commons, who accepts of a place of honour or profit under the crown tenable at pleaſure, and contains further incapacities reſpecting placemen; you complain of this bar-bill as tending to corrupt the bar, and increaſe the influence of the crown in the Houſe of Commons; as to corruption of the bar, the ſalary to each barriſter is ſo ſmall, being 400l. per annum, and the duty ſo heavy, each being obliged to attend eight ſeſſions of the peace annually, in the county to which he is appointed, that no man of any rank at the bar, and of talent worth purchaſing, would accept the place of aſſiſtant barriſter; and as to influence in the Houſe

of

of Commons, all thoſe barriſters are excluded from ſeats in the Houſe; ſuch is your grievance of the bar-bill.

Your enumeration, in your liſt of grievances, of the exertions of the military, and of the civil magiſtrate, in ſuppreſſion of diſorders, more cruel, miſchievous, and deſtructive than the operations of armies in civil wars, or organized rebellions, are all infinitely exaggerated by you, with every circumſtance of the moſt malignant acrimony, and the neceſſity of the exertion, with more than ordinary turpitude, ſuppreſſed; in ſo much that the ſuppreſſion of truth, in this your detail of grievances, betrays more deliberate rancour, and baſeneſs of mind, than the ſuggeſtion of that which is falſe; one village only throughout the kingdom, and that a ſmall one, conſiſting of mean thatched houſes, in the county of Cavan, had been burned by the military in theſe troubles, before the publication of your addreſs; upwards of one thouſand men, all members of the gangs of aſſaſſins, called United Iriſhmen and defenders, and all to a man *energetic Romaniſts*, had aſſembled in and near that village, for the avowed purpoſe of deſtroying by fire and ſword, a neighbouring colony of induſtrious Proteſtant weavers, who were brought from a remote part of the North of Ireland, and ſettled there, by the proprietor of the eſtate; a ſmall party of the militia of the city of Dublin, then quartered in the town of Cavan, were brought out by the civil magiſtrate to ſuppreſs this banditti, they found themſelves unequal to the buſineſs from the number of the inſurgents, and were obliged to ſend to their fellow ſoldiers in Cavan for aſſiſtance; when the reinforcement appeared, the great body of the inſurgents were poſted on a hill at ſome diſtance from the village, through which it was neceſſary to march to attack and diſperſe them, and as the militia, conſiſting only of one company, marched through the village, and were in the middle of it, they were ſuddenly fired upon from all the windows of the houſes on each ſide, and ſome of them killed and wounded; the houſes were all, what in Ireland are called cabins, built of mud and clay, the covering thatch, the windows, if they can be ſo called, were ſmall holes in theſe mud walls,

walls, and the entrances only larger holes; the firing was thick, and heavy, the militia for the preſervation of their lives, were obliged to ſet fire to theſe houſes, and they being contiguous one to the other, and the covering inflammable, the greater part of the village was burnt down, twenty or thirty of the aſſaſſins were ſlain, and the reſt of the gang, ſeeing the ill ſucceſs of their ambuſcade, ran away; ſuch is your burning of villages, and murdering the inhabitants. As to the burning of any other houſes by the military, very few indeed have ſuffered in that way, and that only in ſuch parts of the country, as the number of magiſtrates, required by the inſurrection act, have by petition to government, declared to be in a ſtate of inſurrection, and which have been proclaimed ſo to be accordingly; and where the proceeding to ſuch extremities became abſolutely neceſſary, for the protection of the lives, and properties of his majeſty's loyal ſubjects. The ſame is true, with reſpect to the tranſportation of ſome of your *popular and energetic Romaniſts*; the tranſportation was only ſending them to man his majeſty's fleet, and no perſon was ever ſent to the fleet, except ſuch as fell under the deſcription in the inſurrection act, or before that was enacted, ſuch as were the moſt notorious and profligate vagabonds in the community, who had no viſible way of getting a livelihood, and who were juſtly ſuſpected of being a part of the gangs of nocturnal robbers and aſſaſſins, who were infeſting the country; the military never acted, nor had orders to act, againſt the inſurgents without the civil magiſtrate, except in caſes of the utmoſt extremity, where the houſes of the peaceable and loyal inhabitants would have been burned, themſelves and their families butchered, and their property pillaged or conſumed, had it not been for the intervention of the military.

It is untrue that legal meetings of counties to petition his majeſty, have been prevented by orders given to the military to diſperſe them, where the ſheriff of a county, or even a magiſtrate, had called the freeholders of the county, to meet for the purpoſe of petitioning his majeſty, government has given no orders to the military, or others, to diſ-

perſe

perſe them; you know that no ſuch orders were given to diſperſe two ſuch meetings, which you and your aſſociates held at the Royal Exchange, within twenty yards of the Caſtle of Dublin, the reſidence of the Lord Lieutenant, in the ſummer of 1797; and one of theſe meetings was called, as well as I recollect, by ſome freemen and freeholders of the city, without a magiſtrate; and they called to the meeting not only the freemen and freeholders of the city, but the *houſeholders*, in order to inſure the attendance of a ſufficient mob, of *popular and energetic* Romaniſts; this laſt ſpecies of meeting, you call an *aggregate meeting*, and it was not called for the purpoſe of preparing a petition to his majeſty; and pray, ſir, who told you, that ſuch a meeting was legal, and in what book do you find the law ſo laid down? In my reading I have not been able to find it. It may be much doubted whether the ſheriff of a county has any ſpecial power of calling the freeholders of a county together, for any purpoſe whatſoever, on the requiſition of a certain number of freeholders of the county: he has power by law to call the county together, to attend at the aſſizes, at the quarter ſeſſions, and at elections of members of parliament, or any other county elections, and to attend his county court held monthly, and he can aſſemble the *poſſe comitatûs*, to enable him to execute the king's writs; in all theſe various aſſemblies of the county, the freeholders may, if they think fit, prepare petitions to his Majeſty, and they have opportunities recurring with ſufficient frequency for ſuch purpoſes; but admitting that the ſheriff of a county or a private freeholder, may at all times he thinks proper aſſemble his county, either with or without a requiſition of any freeholders for that purpoſe, where did you find the law, in what book, or in what record, that any freeholder of a county, or any number of freeholders has, or have, a right to aſſemble, not the *freeholders*, but the *houſeholders* of a county, to meet for the purpoſe of petitioning the King, or for any other purpoſe? ſir, you call ſuch *aggregate* meetings as theſe legal; my opinion is otherwiſe, I think they are not legal, even if the convention act, and the acts for ſuppreſſing riots, and

unlawful

unlawful aſſemblies, were out of the queſtion; they certainly tend to diſorder and breach of the peace, by aſſembling the *mob*, and not the *freeholders* of the county, let the pretence for aſſembling be ever ſo plauſible.

Another of your grievances, is the ſuppreſſion of a free preſs, by military force; here you practiſe your uſual malice and deceit, you do not expreſsly allege, that ſuch ſuppreſſion of a free preſs, by military force was by the orders of government; yet you evidently inſinuate it, and wiſh it ſhould be ſo underſtood; for you inſert it in the liſt of grievances, which you impute to government; thus indirectly charging the government with invading the liberty of the preſs. The tranſaction to which you allude is, the deſtruction of the preſs and types of a printing-houſe in Belfaſt, in which was printed the *Northern Star*, the moſt flagitious paper that ever was publiſhed in any *civilized and chriſtian country*, to uſe your own words, or in any country whatſoever, where any form of regular government was preſerved; the circumſtances I ſhall briefly detail. It was diſcovered that ſeveral private men in the militia regiment of the county of Monaghan quartered in Belfaſt, a town notorious for diſaffection and ſedition, had been ſeduced to become members of the infamous ſociety of United Iriſhmen, and had taken the oath adminiſtered to all the members of that deteſtable gang of traitors; many of them were immediately arreſted and tried by courts martial, four of them were condemned to be ſhot, and others of them to various ſpecies of military puniſhment; the four wretches condemned to death, when kneeling on their coffins, prepared for the fatal bullets, declared in the moſt ſolemn manner, that they had been ſeduced from their allegiance, and into the meaſures which brought them to their then deplorable ſituation, principally by reading the treaſonable publications, in the *Northern Star*; and earneſtly exhorted their fellow ſoldiers, never to read that flagitious paper: this pathetic dying exhortation, and the view of the bleeding carcaſes of theſe unhappy victims to treaſon, made ſuch an impreſſion upon the private ſoldiers of the regiment, that upon their return to

their

their quarters they unanimouſly drew up a declaration of their ſincere repentance and their determinations of loyalty for the future, in which they with great juſtice aſcribed the ſeduction of their unfortunate companions and many of themſelves to the wicked and treaſonable artifices of the inhabitants of Belfaſt—this declaration one of their ſerjeants and a few of the privates carried to the two News-papers printed in that town; by one of them (the Belfaſt News-Letter) it was publiſhed; by the other (the Northern Star,) it was rejected with expreſſions of contempt and inſult, though the poor men offered to pay for the inſertion of it at any rate of advertiſing, which the printer ſhould demand; this conduct in the printer of the paper, to which the regiment ſo juſtly attributed the misfortune of their companions, ſo incenſed the private ſoldiers, that ſome of them on the following night ſtole from their quarters, broke into the printing-houſe, and demoliſhed the preſs and types: now, ſir, have you any proof whatſoever, or any reaſon for forming even a probable conjecture, that the above violence committed by a few private militia ſoldiers, was commanded or even countenanced in any manner by the government of this country? if ſo, what are your proofs or reaſons? was not the law of the land open to redreſs thoſe who were injured by the violence? were not the ears of the officers of the regiment open to any complaint, which might have been made on this occaſion? had not the injured full opportunities of applying for redreſs, either to the common law of the land, or to the martial law, if they thought fit? did you ever hear that any perſons employed under government, either directly or indirectly, interfered to ſcreen the offenders from juſtice? if ſo, let us know their names, and the names of your informers; you cannot—you know you cannot—this pretended grievance, like the others, is the creation of your own malice, and every inſinuation you can throw out againſt government, as reſtraining, or even in any manner checking or controlling the liberty of the preſs, ſtands fully and completely refuted by the impunity, which has

has hitherto attended the publication of the ſeditious and treaſonable addreſs, to which I now write an anſwer.

The remainder of your grievances are the ſeveral acts of parliament paſſed in this kingdom for the ſuppreſſion of the preſent diſorders, and the exertions of the magiſtracy and the military, in the execution of them; you tell the ſubjects of this country that the laws of the land, eſtabliſhed by the joint conſent of the king, lords, and commons, the ſupreme conſtitutional legiſlative power of the nation, are horrible oppreſſions, and the execution of them, *robbery and murder*, the effects of a "ruthleſs and horrid tyranny tremendous "and intolerable," and you thus impeach laws, the neceſſity and expediency of which were fully debated in the ſenate of the nation, before they were enacted, and there ſanctioned, by the almoſt unanimous approbation, of the repreſentatives of all the landed, and moneyed intereſt of the nation, of the knights, citizens, and burgeſſes, in parliament aſſembled, you and your party in the Houſe of Commons, who oppoſed theſe laws, never amounting (as I have already obſerved) on any one queſtion relating to them, to the number of thirty, not more than ſix or ſeven of which were repreſentatives for counties, and frequently dwindling to fourteen, and even to ſeven; and the moſt boiſterous and noiſy of your faction, who adhered to you on all queſtions, being members, for what you repreſent as venal boroughs.—You attribute the enaction of all theſe laws to the influence of the crown, exerted in the Houſe of Lords, and Commons; you ſtate that the king is the "*creature of the people*, "and that he may commit treaſon, againſt his *creator the* "*people*," and it is impoſſible to conceive that he can commit greater treaſon againſt the people, than by cauſing by his miniſters, certain ordinances to obtain the ſanction of laws, for the *murder*, and robbery of the people, "for eſta-"bliſhing a ruthleſs, and horrid tyranny over them, tre-"mendous and *intolerable*, and impoſing it on the ſenate, by "influence, and on the people by arms;" ſuch are your expreſſions! The man who writes thus, cannot be ſuppoſed to mean, that ſuch grievances can be remedied by the laws of the

the land, the enactors of which he thus calumniates and vilifies; when he tells the ſubject, that the laws are only a ſyſtem of robbery and murder, of tyranny ruthleſs, horrid, tremendous and *intolerable*; he in fact, not only juſtifies the ſubject in taking arms againſt the government, but he ſtimulates him to do ſo; he muſt look to revolutionary meaſures for redreſs of thoſe pretended grievances, he cannot look to conſtitutional ones, the Robeſpierian method of reforming the ſtate is in your opinion the only effectual one.

I cannot overlook one trait of your character, which manifeſts itſelf in this your liſt of grievances; and that is, the moſt conſummate aſſurance, that any mortal I have ever yet ſeen, or read of, was poſſeſſed of; you inſert in this liſt of grievances, the very acts of parliament, and the exertions of the magiſtracy and military in the execution of them, which your own machinations, and thoſe of your confederates, the *popular and energetic Romaniſts*, and of your colleague Mr. Tone, have rendered abſolutely neceſſary for the preſervation of the ſtate, and of the lives, liberties and properties, of the peaceable and loyal ſubjects of it; for all people converſant in the affairs of Ireland know, that to you and to your aforeſaid confederates, to your and their ſeditious and treaſonable publications, whether as ſpeeches, anſwers, eſſays, or addreſſes, to your intrigues, plots, and conſpiracies, may be fairly traced, as to efficient cauſes, all the outrages, murders, conflagrations, and devaſtations of the United Iriſhmen and defenders, and the conſequent enaction of laws to ſuppreſs them, and the exertions of the civil magiſtracy and military in execution of the laws; your complaints are the ſame as would be thoſe of a murderer and robber, if he ſhould complain of the laws of ſociety for the puniſhment of murder and robbery; but I never yet heard that any murderer or robber was impudent enough to make ſuch complaint.

Mr. Grattan's views in exaggerating the power of France, and depreciating that of Great Britain, and in

But, ſir, you are not content with thus juſtifying rebellion, you feared that the *popular and energetic* Iriſh Romaniſts, together with the republican and atheiſtical Iriſh diſciples of Paine, Price, and Prieſtley, uſurping the name of Proteſtants, would heſitate a little, before they would embark in an open rebellion, for the purpoſe of effecting a ſeparation

introducing the separation of America from Britain into his addreſs.

paration of this iſland from the Britiſh Empire; peace might be concluded between Great Britain and France, in which caſe the rebellion muſt be adjourned, and perhaps poſtponed *ſine Die*. Your advice, to the *popular and energetic* Romaniſts by " no means to poſtpone the conſideration of their " fortunes," " till after the war," required that your confederates ſhould be expeditious in their operations; a dread of the fleets and armies of Great Britain palſied their exertions; this you undertook to cure by the ſtimulating bliſter of your addreſs, and to compoſe it, you mixed up all your pungent provocative drugs of falſehood, miſrepreſentation, acrimonious invective, exaggeration, and depreciation, of which you have a moſt plentiful ſtore; the power of France, without whoſe aid the work of ſeparation could never be attempted or effected, was therefore to be magnified, and that of Great Britain diminiſhed in the ſame ratio; and the ſucceſs of the Americans in the cauſe of ſeparation from the Britiſh Empire was to be decorated with all the pretty flowers of language and metaphor you were capable of culling.

The preſent war with France you repreſent as " unpa- " ralleled in expence and diſgrace, and attended with the " groſſeſt and rankeſt errors, cloſing the account of blood " with proclamations of inſolvency, with the loſs of our ſta- " tion in Europe, and of one hundred and thirty millions, " to loſe that ſtation,—to place the crown of England as low " in Europe, as America, and to put France at the head of " Europe, inſtead of Great Britain, while her people crouch " under a load of debt, and taxes, without an empire to con- " ſole, or a conſtitution to cover them, the King of Great " Britain is put at the feet of France, he is driven out of al- " moſt all footing in Europe, and the enemy have made " gigantic encroachments on the Britiſh empire;" and all theſe evils and diſaſters you attribute to the miniſters of the crown, that is, to the crown, employing corruption to ſway a borough parliament, meaning the parliament of Great Britain, which you brand here with the epithet of a borough parliament, ſo often beſtowed by you on the parliament of Ireland;

Ireland; you add alſo to the liſt of calamities, " the loſs of thirteen provinces in America, and of an hundred and twenty millions of money to loſe thoſe provinces."

After painting Great Britain thus as an undone nation, deſpoiled of her territories, and at the feet of France, that is ſubdued by France, or unable to make any further reſiſtance againſt her, and conſequently unable to quell any inſurrection or rebellion in Ireland, or to afford any aſſiſtance to the loyal ſubjects of Ireland, when ſuch rebellion ſhall blaze out; you proceed to the praiſe of the American revolution, in which you make a clear avowal of your dangerous deſigns, and cloſe your eulogy upon it, in a flouriſhing ſtrain of figurative expreſſion, alluding to a circumſtance of Holy Writ, with which you thought proper to ornament, and enforce the menace contained in it, againſt all Iriſh loyaliſts, (that is, all the Proteſtants of the eſtabliſhed church, and all the real chriſtian Diſſenters in Ireland, in whoſe poſſeſſion is almoſt the whole of the landed and perſonal property of the kingdom) in caſe they ſhould dare to oppoſe the projected rebellion of your *popular and energetic Romaniſts*, thus notoriouſly holding up the formation of a republic in America ſeparated from Great Britain by the perfidious intervention of France, as an example worthy to be imitated by your Iriſh confederates. I ſhall quote the paſſage here: " We ſaw in the " American revolution, that a people determined to be free " cannot be enſlaved, that the Britiſh government was not " equal to the taſk, even in plenitude of empire, ſupported " by the different governments of the provinces, and by the " *ſad apoſtacy* of the hapleſs loyaliſt; that loyaliſt is a leſſon " to the rich and great, to ſtand by their country in all ſitu- " ations—and that in a conteſt with a *remote court, the firſt* " *poſt of ſafety is to ſtand by the country, the ſecond poſt of* " *ſafety is to ſtand by the country, and the third poſt of ſafety* " *is to ſtand by the country;* in that American conteſt we " ſaw that *reform*, which had been born in England, and " baniſhed to America, advanced like the ſhepherd lad in " Holy Writ, and overthrew Goliath—he returned riding " on the waves of the Atlantic, and his ſpirit moved on the

" waters of Europe, the royal ſhip of France went down,—" the Britiſh man of war labours." And at the ſame time that you encourage your *popular and energetic Iriſh Romaniſts* to rebellion, by magnifying the power of France, and depreciating that of Great Britain, you encourage and incite the French, to invade your native country, by repreſenting the power of Britain to be ſo enfeebled, and her reſources ſo exhauſted, that ſhe cannot prevent the irruption of the French armies into this iſland, or even impede their progreſs when they ſhall land therein.

I ſhall firſt examine how far you are warranted by fact in your aſſertions of diſgrace of the Britiſh arms, and of the gigantic encroachments of the enemy on the Britiſh empire, during this war, which ſhe has been obliged to wage for ſelf-defence only, againſt the unprovoked attack, of the moſt barbarous and faithleſs nation, which ever yet deluged the earth with the blood of the human ſpecies, and whoſe mercileſs hoſtilities againſt your country, you are wicked enough to repreſent as a war undertaken by them in the great cauſe *of popular liberty*. I cannot in the progreſs of this war, find any diſgrace of the Britiſh arms, unleſs you are pleaſed ſo to ſtile their inability to do, or failure in doing, all the miſchief to the enemy, which every loyal ſubject might conceive or wiſh to be practicable; as for inſtance, the inability of our commanders to retain Toulon, though they had therein taken and deſtroyed a great part of the navy of France, demoliſhed one of the greateſt naval arſenals in the world; and for the preſent almoſt annihilated the French power in the Mediterranean Sea. A ſecond inſtance is the inability of Earl Howe to take and deſtroy the whole French ſquadron which he engaged, he only took ſix capital ſhips, and ſo diſabled the reſt, that ſome of them have remained as wrecks in the port of Breſt ever ſince, and have been condemned as irreparable, the remainder lay in port unrepaired for a year afterwards. A third inſtance, a ſimilar inability in Lord Bridport, who only took and deſtroyed part of the enemy's fleet, and keeps all the reſt now beſieged in Breſt, but cannot take that fortreſs, nor deſtroy the remains of the French navy incloſed in

its

its port. The inability of the Britiſh arms to retain the iſland of Guadaloupe, after they had conquered it, or compleatly to reduce the French colony of St. Domingo; though they have reduced the French to the neceſſity of utterly deſolating theſe two almoſt-invaluable colonies, and rendering them for ever unproductive to France, or nearly ſo, by their putting arms into the hands of their negro ſlaves, for the defence of them; the negroes having now got the whole civil and military power in thoſe iſlands into their hands, will never return to the mattock or the hoe; they will defend theſe iſlands for themſelves, not for their former French maſters. Other inſtances of diſgraces and defeats of the Britiſh arms in this war are, the inability of Earl St. Vincent to reduce Cadiz, and ſeize the whole Spaniſh fleet, though with a ſquadron greatly inferior in number of ſhips, men, and guns, he defeated the Spaniſh fleet, took four of their capital ſhips, drove the reſt into Cadiz, where he has beſieged them now for upwards of nine months, cruiſing at the mouth of the principal harbour of Spain, in the ſight, and almoſt within gun ſhot of a fleet vaſtly ſuperior in number, and annihilating the trade of that emporium of European commerce. The inability of Admiral Duncan, compleatly to deſtroy the Dutch fleet, though he has taken and deſtroyed two-thirds of it, and keeps the remainder blocked up in the Texel, utterly annihilating the Dutch trade; whilſt the ſquadron which that power found means to ſend abroad has become an eaſy prey to the Britiſh navy; ſuch have been the only diſgraces experienced by the Britiſh arms, in the courſe of this war. Let us now enquire what have been the gigantic encroachments of the enemy on the Britiſh Empire in the courſe of the war. I cannot find any encroachments, not even pigmy ones; I can find that Britain has made very great and very valuable encroachments on the territories of the enemy during the war; ſhe has ſeized the moſt valuable poſſeſſions of the French in the Weſt Indies, and has compelled them, conſcious of their inferiority, to deſolate the remainder, that they might not, if conquered, increaſe the power of Britain. She has driven France from the Newfoundland fiſhery, and

ſeized the iſlands St. Pierre, and Miquelon, in the gulph of St. Laurence. She has expelled France from the Eaſt Indies, except from two ſmall iſlands, unproductive in themſelves, and retained by the French at a very great expence, as a ſtation for their piratical cruiſers, which the Britiſh power in the Eaſt Indies ſo control, that their depredations do not anſwer the expence of their equipment. Britain has ſeized on the Cape of Good Hope, the key of eaſtern commerce, and of the iſland of Ceylon, in which is the only port, Trincomale, where great ſhips can refit, from Bombay to the mouth of the Ganges; and by theſe means ſhe has ſecured to herſelf the excluſive commerce of the whole great peninſula of India. She has alſo ſeized on the ſpice iſlands, thoſe inexhauſtible mines of wealth. The French themſelves admit, that they have made no encroachments on Britain, for their only demand on the laſt negociation of peace was, that Britain ſhould reſtore all her conqueſts on the territories of France, and her allies, which demand was as ſcornfully rejected by Britain, as it was inſolently made. With as little truth do you aſſert that the king of Great Britain is put at the feet of France, and driven out of all footing in Europe. What territory did the monarch of Britain poſſeſs in Europe, before the war, which he does not now poſſeſs? If the troops which he ſent to the aid of the Dutch, have been forced to abandon Holland, it was not in conſequence of any defeat which they ſuffered, it was in conſequence of the treachery of a Jacobin faction in Holland, which had ſold their country to the French. Such traitors were not to be defended, and that unhappy country now groans under the moſt intolerable internal ſlavery to the French, and as it is in fact become a province of France, Great Britain engaged in a war with France has poſſeſſed herſelf of all the external powers of that ſtate, to wit, her commerce and her colonies. In fact, Great Britain has at preſent poſſeſſed herſelf of almoſt the whole commerce of the European world, and has deſtroyed that of France, Spain, and Holland. The Britiſh monarch is not "*worked out of his Empire*," as you aſſert, nor has Britain loſt any part of her European territories, and therefore

therefore ſhe has loſt no footing in Europe, which ſhe poſſeſſed before the war, except her commercial footing with France and her allies, which ſhe muſt always loſe in every war with France, whilſt the war continues. Having thus expoſed the falſity of your ſtatement of the preſent ſituation of Britain with reſpect to power and Empire, I ſhall not waſte my time, in defending the Britiſh conſtitution againſt your inſolent attack in the following words: "The "people of Britain are without an Empire to conſole, or a "conſtitution to cover them:" it would be loſt labour; the people of Britain (your Jacobin maſters excepted) will only ſmile with contempt at ſuch the groundleſs petulant invective of a little Iriſh demagogue!

Thus I have expoſed your falſehood, in reſpect to the preſent ſituation of Britain, and your malevolent views, in introducing the American revolution into your addreſs, and the loſs of thirteen provinces to Great Britain in a former war, when Mr. Pitt, the miniſter to whom you allude, was not the prime miniſter, nor any miniſter whatſoever, and to whom you cannot impute the loſs of theſe provinces. As to the loſs ſuſtained by the Britiſh Empire, by the ſeparation of theſe provinces from it, the amount of it is not very eaſily determined; there are men, and very able men too, who maintain that the relinquiſhment of the *jus dominii*, the right of direct dominion, over theſe provinces by Britain, has been ſo far from a loſs to the latter country, that it is an advantage. They argue thus: colonies in diſtant regions are only advantageous to a parent country, ſo far as they afford a beneficial market for the commodities and manufactures of, or commerce to the parent country; in any other light, colonies in very diſtant regions are ſo far from being advantageous, that they are extremely prejudicial, as they are drains of the population of the parent country, as well as of her wealth, in defraying the expences of civil and military eſtabliſhments within them, and involving the parent country in wars for their ſupport; and if the parent country can retain the trade of a colony, without being at the expence of maintaining civil and military eſtabliſhments within it, and without waging

Diſcuſſion of the queſtion, Whether the power of Great Britain be diminiſhed by the ſeparation of America?

ing wars for its ſupport, further than as it would ſupport an allied power, the parent ſtate will gain, and not loſe, by its being diſmembered from it; as the human frame is invigorated, not debilitated, by the lopping off a large wen, which during its adheſion ſucks away its vital juices. Theſe arguments they juſtify by experience; for they allege, that during the connexion between Great Britain and the thirteen ſtates of America, theſe ſtates involved Britain in more than one deſtructive war for their ſupport, and put her to immenſe expence in maintaining civil and military eſtabliſhments within them; that an attempt on the part of Britain to raiſe ſupplies from them for the maintenance of theſe eſtabliſhments, when they were refuſed by their colonial aſſemblies, was the apparent immediate cauſe of the ſeparation, although the real cauſe lay much deeper, in the ſecret intrigues of factious demagogues amongſt them with the French nation, as may be proved from the Memoirs of the Marquis of Montcalm, French Governor of Canada, at the time the Britiſh arms expelled the French from North America; and that ſince this ſeparation, Great Britain enjoys a much more extenſive and beneficial trade with theſe ſtates, than ſhe did before; the excluſive benefit of which trade, the nature and quality of the wants and demands of the Americans, and of the products and manufactures of Great Britain, ſecure to her beyond any poſſible competition, at the ſame time that ſhe is exonerated from the expence, and diſcharged from the military protection ſhe was obliged to furniſh, when they acknowledged her dominion: I fully acquieſce in the force of theſe arguments, as they carry conviction along with them, and I never heard them controverted; ſolid advantages contribute much more to the wealth and ſtrength of an empire, than the vain parade of expenſive and uſeleſs, though extenſive, dominion; and no nation more ſtrongly verifies this doctrine than Spain; for if her power was to be eſtimated by the extent of her colonies, ſhe would be the moſt powerful nation upon earth.

You,

You, ſir, have introduced the American Revolution into your addreſs, to depreciate the Britiſh power; and to ſtimulate your *popular and energetic Iriſh Romaniſts* to revolt by the example, you tell them, "that they ſaw in the American "Revolution, that a people determined to be free, cannot "be enſlaved," at the ſame time that you tell them, one great object with you, is their *emancipation*, conſequently that they are at preſent ſlaves; you then proceed menacingly to admoniſh the rich and great, that is, all the Proteſtants of Ireland, the few Romiſh nobility and old gentry, and every Iriſhman of property, to join the inſurgents, *your indigent energetic Romaniſts*, when the rebellion ſhall commence, by the example of the hard fate of the American loyaliſts, whom with equal falſehood and virulence you ſtile *apoſtates*; and you tell the rich and great, amongſt the Iriſh, "that the American *apoſtate hapleſs loyaliſt*, is a leſſon to "them to ſtand by their country in all ſituations—and that "in a conteſt with a *remote court*" (meaning the Britiſh court) "the firſt poſt of ſafety is to ſtand by the country, "and the ſecond poſt of ſafety is to ſtand by the country, "and the third poſt of ſafety is to ſtand by the country," *elegant climax!* The plain Engliſh of this is, when the country, that is, the vulgar, the mean, and the indigent, part of the Iriſh nation, ſhall rebel againſt their preſent ſovereign the king of Great Britain *a foreigner*, you, the rich and great, muſt not preſume to reſiſt, your oaths of allegiance are no longer binding, you are no longer to ſupport the conſtitution, and the head of that conſtitution, his Majeſty; you muſt inſtantly join the mob, they are the *nation*, they are the country, I have often repeated that they are the phyſical ſtrength of the nation, they are the people, and therefore the *creators* of the king: you owe a higher allegiance to them, than to the king, who is but their *creature*, and dethronable at their pleaſure; the nobility of France ſtuck by the throne againſt the people, "*they only encumbered the throne with their ruins.*" If you do not on the breaking out of an Iriſh rebellion, immediately take your ſtation in the

Further remarks on Mr. Grattan's introduction of the American Revolution into his addreſs.

the ranks of the rebels, you are *apoſtates*, enemies of God and man, you ſhall be butchered like the French nobility and gentry, or robbed of your property, and exiled like the American loyaliſts. The rancour of your heart may be ſufficiently eſtimated by the term of reproach, *apoſtate*, beſtowed by you on the American loyaliſt; it is a term of peculiar contumely, generally applied to thoſe who deſert the chriſtian religion, and of the ſame import with renegado; you affix to it the meaning of deſerter of the cauſe of his country, and you add *hapleſs* to it, further to degrade the loyaliſt by repreſenting him as in a forlorn condition, the conſequence of his apoſtacy, and to inſult him with your pity; how has the American loyaliſt deſerved ſuch treatment, from any one—even from a traitor, who had remaining in his breaſt the ſmalleſt ſpark of good nature, of generoſity, or honour? Theſe gentlemen were born and educated in provinces, ſubject to the Britiſh Empire; rebellion raiſed its ſtandard in theſe provinces, on pretence of violation of civil privileges by the parent ſtate, though the charters of theſe provinces (granted by the parent ſtate to its ſubjects, ſent out as its factors to ſettle in ſavage countries, and there to ſuperintend the diſpoſal of its commodities, and ſpecifying the preciſe conditions on which theſe ſubjects were equipped, diſpatched and ſupported, who had voluntarily engaged in the buſineſs, and ſolicited the appointments) excluded them from theſe privileges: the charter of Penſylvania in particular, and that of moſt, if not all the others, providing that the ſettlers in theſe provinces ſhould always be bound by, and ſubmit to, the acts of the Britiſh parliament, or the rules eſtabliſhed, or to be eſtabliſhed, by the king of England, and his privy council. The real cauſes of the Americans taking up arms againſt the parent country were the intrigues of the French nation, which from their natural enmity to Britain, ſuggeſted to the Americans the practicability of ſeparating themſelves from the parent ſtate, and offered to aſſiſt them in the undertaking; their diſtance from the head and great body of the Britiſh empire, and the nature and vaſt extent of their country, preſenting to their view the moſt flattering hopes of

ſucceſs

ſucceſs, which the event realized; the American loyaliſts, juſtly thinking, that the whole Britiſh empire, not any particular province of it, was the country of every natural-born ſubject of the empire, took up arms in ſupport of their country, as their duty to it, to their God, and their king, demanded from them; they were unſucceſsful, and loſt their property in the provinces, torn by treachery and rebellion from the empire, and many of them loſt their lives in the conteſt, ſealing their fidelity with their blood, and glorying in the title of loyaliſt, expreſſive of their unſhaken integrity, *fidei intemeratæ*, which even *you* deny them not; and theſe martyrs to the love of their country, to honour and good faith, you ſtile *apoſtates*. Miſerable man! fly from ſociety—the wretch who thinks incorruptible fidelity, *apoſtacy*, ought not to aſſociate with man; let him repair to the deſert; foxes, wolves, tigers, and other ſavage animals, remarkable for ferocity and treachery, are his only proper companions!

However, ſir, though you think fit to menace the rich and great in Ireland, with the fate of the American loyaliſt, if they ſhall dare to reſiſt the projected rebellion of your *popular and energetic Iriſh Romaniſts*, and inſinuate that the condition of theſe loyaliſts is very miſerable, yet ſuch inſinuation is not ſtrictly true; for firſt theſe loyaliſts are ſupported in their misfortunes, by a conſciouſneſs of their having acted as faithful, honourable, and ſpirited citizens: their ill ſucceſs, ſo far from diminiſhing their merit, enhances it; they are not of the ſame opinion, with the bloody fanaticks in the unhappy reign of Charles the firſt, who deemed their ſucceſs a proof of the juſtice of their cauſe, and that God had decided in their favour, thus impiouſly attributing to the Deity, an approbation of rebellion, ſlaughter and robbery: the American loyaliſt, well knows the truth of the adage, *nunquam ſucceſſu creſcit honeſtum*, he knows experimentally the truth of theſe fine lines in Mr. Addiſon's Cato:

> " 'Tis not in mortals to command ſucceſs,
> " But we'll do more, Sempronius, we'll deſerve it."

And ſecondly, their grateful country has given to theſe loyaliſts a compenſation for their loſſes: the Britiſh parliament has,

has, with equal generoſity and juſtice, voted very large ſums of money for their relief.

It remains now to be examined, Whether the example of the American revolution can inſpire your *popular and energetic Iriſh Romaniſts*, with any reaſonable hopes of a ſimilar revolution in their favour, by their rebellion, and the aſſiſtance of the French aſſaſſins? and firſt, the different ſituations of the thirteen provinces of America, and Ireland are to be conſidered.

Remarks on the different ſituations and circumſtances of America and Ireland.

Theſe provinces, which were colonies of the Britiſh Empire, and now form a ſeparate republick, which I ſhall ſtile Britiſh America, extend upwards of three thouſand miles along the ſhores of the Atlantick Ocean; their inland extent is unknown, and their diſtance from Britain is one thouſand leagues in the neareſt part; they are every where indented with huge bays, and inlets of the ſea, ſome of which may be not improperly ſtiled mediterranean ſeas; they are interſected by great rivers, and for the moſt part, at any conſiderable diſtance from the ſhores, uninhabited, and covered with immenſe foreſts. Ireland is an iſland on all ſides acceſſible to the Britiſh fleets, ſeparated from Great Britain by a channel from about thirty to ſix leagues broad, and eighty leagues long, and Great Britain lies between it and the continent of Europe; it is an open country, without foreſts and without fortifications. The obvious cauſe of the ill ſucceſs of the Britiſh arms in America, was the nature of the country, and its diſtance from Britain, and neither the courage or power of the Americans, or their treacherous allies the French; the expence of tranſporting great armies, the ſubſiſting, and ſupplying them with all kinds of military ſtores when tranſported, at ſuch a diſtance was enormous; and both ſubſiſtence and ſupply hazardous and precarious: the marches of the army in a country, interſected by great rivers, were attended with great difficulty and danger, particularly as it was covered with foreſts, where ſmall bodies of light troops could haraſs and retard the advances of numerous and formidable forces; the partial population of the country in patches called plantations, near the ſea and great rivers,

and

and its immenſe extent, rendered a permanent conqueſt of it impracticable; a planted diſtrict here and there, as it required a military force to conquer it, ſo it required a military force to preſerve the conqueſt; and as many military poſts were required, as there were planted diſtricts. In Ireland every one of theſe natural defences are wanting, and the triumphant Britiſh navy rides miſtreſs of the ocean, always ready to intercept foreign ſuccours to Iriſh rebels, and even without that bar to the interference of foreigners, on any diſpute between Great Britain and Ireland, the Britiſh arms muſt have a deciſive advantage by the proximity of the two iſlands. Troops and warlike ſtores could at all times be ſent with certainty in a few hours from Britain to Ireland, in ſmall and even undecked veſſels; and not from any part of the continent of Europe, but at the intervals of weeks, perhaps of months, according to the variation of the winds, and ſeaſons, in ſtout veſſels, and always with the proviſion for, and at the hazard of, a long ſea voyage: the ſuperficial contents of the iſland of Great Britain are to thoſe of Ireland, in the proportion of ſeven to two, or three and a half to one; the aggregate population of Great Britain, (ſuppoſing its local population in all parts only equal to that of Ireland) muſt therefore be to that of Ireland in the ſame proportion; but it is certainly much greater, ſo that it may with reaſon be concluded, that its inhabitants are four-fold more numerous than thoſe of Ireland; they are infinitely richer, and their trade and maritime power, conſidered, which in eſtimating the relative ſtrength of iſlands is of prime conſideration, Great Britain muſt be more powerful than Ireland in a tenfold proportion at leaſt, and probably in a greater; to all this muſt be added, the different diſpoſitions, views, and intereſts, of the people of Ireland; the Romaniſts of Ireland may be computed at nearly two-thirds of the inhabitants. Your colleague, Tone, in his information to the French Convention, admits that they are the pooreſt claſs in the community. I have already mentioned their relative poverty; of this claſs of inhabitants, I am well convinced two-thirds are eaſy and happy under the preſent conſtitution, and would not join the ſtandard of rebellion, for the purpoſe of ſepa-

rating

rating this iſland from the Britiſh Empire, and ſetting up an independent democratic republic; if in the criſis of ſuch an attempt they did not ſtand by government, they would at leaſt be neuter; the nobility, and old gentry of that communion, poſſeſſed of ancient eſtates, very few indeed in number, would ſtick by the crown, becauſe it is notoriouſly their intereſt ſo to do, and becauſe they now enjoy all the benefits and privileges of the conſtitution, equally with Proteſtants, except the few herein before mentioned, from which they in fact exclude themſelves, and for the attainment of which, on their own terms, they would never riſk a civil war with their Proteſtant countrymen and Great Britain. The Iriſh Proteſtants of the eſtabliſhed church, would to a man reſiſt ſuch a rebellion, and your colleague, Tone, admits, "that "they have engroſſed, beſides the whole church patronage, "all the profits and honours of the country excluſively, and "a very great ſhare of the landed property, that they are "ariſtocrats, adverſe to any change, and decided enemies "of the French revolution;" that is, that they are the moſt powerful and the richeſt members of the ſtate, and to a man loyal ſubjects. The Proteſtant Diſſenters of Ireland, your colleague, Tone, thinks would all join the republican ſtandard; you ſeem to think ſo too, but I muſt take the liberty of differing from you both. Such Proteſtant Diſſenters, as are real chriſtians, a very few excepted, would reſiſt a rebellion of Iriſh Romaniſts, who would certainly compoſe the great bulk of the inſurgents; they would conſider, that in an Iriſh independent democratic republic, the Romaniſts, from their great exceſs over them in number, muſt be their abſolute rulers, and they would ſpurn the idea of ſubmitting their lives and properties to the mercy of an Iriſh Romiſh democracy, and exchanging conſtitutional civil liberty, for the tyranny of a mob government, the only calm to be expected after a tempeſt of ſucceſsful rebellion and devaſtation. Such Diſſenters indeed, as uſurp the name of Proteſtants, but who are in reality Atheiſts, and Deiſts, the diſciples of Paine, Price, and Prieſtley, philoſophers of the new French ſchool, in which every profeſſor is eminent exactly in proportion to his ignorance and brutality, thank Heaven, they are not numerous

merous in Ireland! ſuch Diſſenters, I ſay, would as far as in their power ſtrengthen the ranks of rebellion; to ſuch an infernal crew, *your popular and energetic Romaniſts*, that is, a few traders in ſome commercial towns in Ireland, and the Romiſh mob of ſuch towns, would certainly attach themſelves. To ſuch a deteſtable yet feeble confederacy, excluſive of the Britiſh fleets and armies, would be oppoſed the flower of the Iriſh nation, whether we conſider rank, ſtation, wealth, ability, or even number, the event of ſuch a conteſt would neither be protracted nor uncertain.*

The events of former rebellions in Ireland, for the purpoſe of ſevering Ireland from the Britiſh Empire recited.

With a malignant kind of dexterity, you throw a veil over the events of rebellions in Ireland, undertaken for the avowed purpoſe of ſevering this country from Great Britain, and eſtabliſhing an independent government in it; whether monarchical or republican, ſignified not, it was to be independent of the Britiſh monarchy: and to encourage revolt, you hold up the recent American revolution, painted in glowing colours, to the Iriſh nation, as an example worthy of imitation. It ſhall be part of my buſineſs to recall the attention of my countrymen, to the events of the rebellions heretofore commenced by the Iriſh Romaniſts, in the cauſe of ſeparation, when the relative power of the Iriſh Romaniſt to that of the Iriſh Proteſtant, bore an infinitely greater proportion than it does at preſent; for the cauſe of ſeparation from, and independency on Britain is not now a new cauſe of rebellion, it has been repeatedly fought and decided on the Iriſh ſtage. Paſſing over the almoſt continued hoſtility between powerful ſepts, and the Britiſh colonies in Ireland, from the firſt conqueſt of Ireland, by Britain, in the reign of Henry the ſecond, I ſhall come at once to the reign of queen Elizabeth. In her reign, the Earl of Deſmond, a great nobleman, originally of Engliſh blood, whoſe dominions extended almoſt all over Munſter, entered into a league with the then powerful Spaniſh monarchy, for ſevering Ireland from England, and rendering it independent; he

* Since the firſt publication of this work, the rebellion broke out, and the Popiſh Rebels with unparalleled cruelty, committed a variety of maſſacres, in different parts of the Kingdom, on all Proteſtants who fell into their hands: but they were ſoon defeated, and the above prediction verifyed.

he took up arms, and pretending he did ſo, in ſupport of the Romiſh religion, he was joined by almoſt the whole Iriſh nation, then bigotted Romaniſts; the very Engliſh colonies, which acknowledged the queen as their ſovereign, being then moſtly Romaniſts, and confined to a few counties in Leinſter, the Spaniards ſent him great ſupplies of military ſtores, and troops; yet the power of England ſoon cruſhed him and his adherents, and his head was ſtuck up, as the head of a traitor, on London bridge. The great Earl of Tyrone, the ableſt Iriſh chieftain, both as to courage and ſkill, which had before that time appeared, and who had been trained to arms, in the army of Elizabeth herſelf, next raiſed a rebellion in Ireland, in the very ſame cauſe of independence on, and ſeparation from, England; he was alſo aſſiſted by Spain, at that time the moſt powerful nation in Europe, who ſent at one time ſix thouſand Spaniſh infantry, famous for their ſuperior diſcipline over all other Europeans, and then a very conſiderable army, to his aſſiſtance; he was joined by the whole body of the Iriſh nation, then forty to one in number over the Engliſh colonies, yet he and the Iriſh nation were in a few campaigns compleatly ſubdued and conquered by the power of England; and the conſequences of this rebellion and ſuppreſſion were, the ſlaughter or diſperſion into foreign countries, of all the Iriſh chieftains who ſerved under him, and of the greater part of the inhabitants of ſix whole counties in the northern part of this kingdom; the calamities brought upon the Iriſh Romaniſts by that unſucceſsful rebellion, as may be learned from Morriſon, and other cotemporary writers, can only be equalled by thoſe of the Jews, at the time of the deſtruction of Jeruſalem by the Romans; England in thoſe two laſt mentioned rebellions, was unaided by Scotland, then a diſtinct kingdom. The next rebellion in the cauſe of ſeparation from England, and independence, was that which commenced with the horrible Iriſh maſſacre in the year 1641, that maſſacre which you ſo zealouſly and ſo officiouſly juſtify! the Iriſh Romaniſts at that time, encouraged by the diſtracted ſtate of public affairs in England, and abetted by the republicans in that country (as you are at preſent by your maſters, the Engliſh

jacobins)

jacobins) broke out into rebellion for the purpoſe of ſeparation and independence; the Iriſh Romaniſts, at the breaking out of this rebellion, were in the proportion of eleven to two, to the Iriſh Proteſtants, or of five and a half to one, according to Sir William Petty, *(ſee his political anatomy of Ireland)* the ſame author ſtates, that they murdered thirty ſeven thouſand Iriſh Proteſtants, in the firſt year of the rebellion in cold blood; the Engliſh army in Ireland did not amount at that time to four thouſand men, ill paid and ill clothed, the Iriſh Romaniſts ſuddenly poſſeſſed themſelves of nine-tenth parts of the kingdom; as ſoon however, as their quondam abettors, the Engliſh republicans, had done their buſineſs in England, they would not ſuffer Ireland to remain an independent ſtate, they immediately ſent an army to reduce their Iriſh aſſociates in rebellion and murder, and in two ſhort campaigns effected a complete conqueſt of Ireland, and ſlew in the field, hanged and quartered, or drove into exile, all the *energetic Iriſh Romaniſts* of that day. Of the leaders executed I ſhall mention two only of eminent turpitude; Lord Maguire hanged and quartered at Tyburn, and his head fixed on London bridge; and Sir Phelim O'Neil, hanged and quartered at Stephen's-green, and his head fixed on Newgate in Dublin; they confiſcated all their eſtates, beſtowing them upon the Engliſh ſoldiers; and finally Cromwell, firſt their general and then their dictator, wiſely united Ireland to England, cauſing thirty members to ſit as repreſentatives of Ireland in the Britiſh parliament. The deſolation and havock brought by this rebellion in the cauſe of ſeparation and independence on the kingdom would be almoſt incredible, were it not teſtified by unqueſtionable authorities.

The laſt rebellion of the Iriſh Romaniſts againſt the crown of England, was that which commenced in the reign of King William and Queen Mary. At this period the Iriſh Romaniſts, by the agency of Lord Tyrconnel, appointed Lord Lieutenant of the kingdom by King James the Second, were in poſſeſſion of almoſt all employments of truſt and confidence in the nation; many of the Iriſh nobility and gentry of that day,

day, were Romaniſts, and many of the Iriſh, as well as Engliſh Proteſtants, were diſaffected to the revolution and the government of King William. The Iriſh Romaniſts almoſt to a man, eſpouſed the cauſe of the abdicated monarch, not out of any affection to him, but with the hopes by his means of obtaining independence; one hundred thouſand effective men, all Iriſh Romaniſts, flew to arms; the dethroned king, their engine of ſeparation, unable to ſupport and arm ſuch a number, regimented ſixty thouſand of them, diſpoſing them into fifty regiments of foot, and ſixteen of horſe; the French monarch Lewis the fourteenth, then in the zenith of his power, ſent experienced generals and officers to command and train the Iriſh army, and many thouſand veteran French troops to aſſiſt them, with all kind of military ſtores, cloathing and arms; his fleet rode triumphant on the ſea, having defeated the Britiſh fleet under Lord Torrington, off the ſouthern coaſt of Ireland; a ſmall body of Iriſh Proteſtants only, in the northern part of this kingdom, took up arms to ſtem this torrent, but they would have been ſoon ſwallowed up, had they not received ſpeedy ſuccours from England, and an Engliſh army, aſſiſted by the Iriſh Proteſtants, made a complete conqueſt of the Iriſh Romaniſts of that day, and of their French auxiliaries, in three campaigns, drove ſuch of them as eſcaped the ſword, peſtilence and famine, miſerable exiles into foreign countries, and confiſcated their eſtates and property.

That the Iriſh Romaniſts adhered to King James with no other view, than by his means to ſeparate Ireland from the Britiſh empire, may be proved by numberleſs occurrences during that ſhort war. I ſhall mention only two of them: when he aſſembled the Romiſh convention, which he and his adherents called a parliament in Dublin, one of their firſt meaſures was the preparing a bill, declaring the independence of the kingdom of Ireland on the crown of England: James when the bill was tendered to him for the royal aſſent heſitated; he had ſtill hopes of remounting the throne of England, and he feared that his aſſenting to ſuch a bill would diſguſt and alienate his Engliſh friends, and impair his own authority

authority if he ſhould remount the throne: but the Iriſh Romaniſts told him plainly, that if he refuſed his aſſent to the bill, they had no further occaſion for him, that he might go about his buſineſs, and that they would eſtabliſh a government without him. This ſame pretended parliament alſo attainted by bill, ſeveral thouſand Iriſh Proteſtants, including in it by the lump all men of that perſuaſion, of rank, conſequence, or property; and paſſed a bill for depriving the Proteſtant clergy, of almoſt the whole of their tithes, and for rendering the recovery of the remaining pittance impracticable.

Don't you deplore, ſir, the ill ſucceſs and unhappy fate of the members of this pretended parliament, all ſlaughtered, hanged or tranſported, for maintaining your glorious and patriotick principles of ſeparation from England, and ſubverſion of the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment; patriots as illuſtrious as yourſelf!

Another ſignal inſtance of the contempt, in which the Iriſh Romaniſts of that day held James and his authority, and that they meant only to make a tool of him for effecting their own purpoſes is, that when his deputy Lord Tyrconnel repaired to the Iriſh camp, after the departure of James to France, one of the principal Iriſh officers came to him, and commanded him inſtantly to quit the camp, or he would cut his tent cords, with which command the hapleſs deputy was obliged to comply.

One other example of unſucceſsful rebellion, in the cauſe of ſeparation and independence I omitted to introduce in its rank in point of time, becauſe it was not the rebellion of the whole native Iriſh, and degenerate Engliſh coloniſts in Ireland, but of a part only of both races; and that is the rebellion of Thomas Fitzgerald Lord Offaley, eldeſt ſon and heir of the Earl of Kildare, in the reign of King Henry the eighth; that nobleman, being then chief governor of Ireland under the king, broke out into open rebellion, renounced his allegiance to King Henry, and ſet himſelf up as an independent prince; in a ſhort time, he and his adherents were reduced, and himſelf with five of his uncles taken priſoners,

they were ſent to England, and hanged and quartered as traitors at Tyburn, the earl his father died of grief, a priſoner in the Tower of London, and the whole family eſtate was confiſcated. This illuſtrious race of the Fitzgeralds would have been extinguiſhed, had not Queen Mary, out of compaſſion to the misfortunes of that great houſe, afterwards reſtored the only ſhoot which remained of the ancient trunk, to his family honours and eſtate.

And now, ſir, having rehearſed to you the miſerable fate of Lord Offaley, and his uncles; of the Earls of Deſmond, and Tyrone; of Lord Maguire, and Sir Phelim O'Neil; of the Romiſh parliament convened by King James, and of all their adherents, all Iriſh Romaniſts, and all engaged in the ſame cauſe, of which you have now ſet yourſelf up as the champion, that is the cauſe of ſeparation from Great Britain and independence on the Britiſh crown, I leave you to ſound the trumpet of inſurrection, and to cheer in vain your murdering tattered bands of *popular and energetic Romaniſts*, by the example of ſucceſsful rebellion in America, a diſtant country, and to waſte your poiſonous breath, and acrimonious ink, in fruitleſs attempts to depreſs the ſpirits of his Majeſty's faithful and loyal Iriſh ſubjects, by the example of the unſucceſsful American loyaliſts. Raiſe your ominous voice, and croak aloud to your *black*, to your *grey*, or to your *green* flock, in the figures ſo often uſed by you in your declamations, vulgarly called nonſenſe, ſuch as, "a naked man op-"preſſed by the ſtate is an armed poſt; the government "*bloods* the magiſtracy with the peoples liberty"—all you will be able to do, and it is miſchief enough, is to encourage a few deſperate aſſaſſins and robbers in different parts of the kingdom, to perſiſt in their nocturnal murders, and plunder, till they expiate their crimes on the avenging gibbet, juſtly accuſing with their laſt breath, (as did the privates of the Monaghan militia ſhot for a mutiny) flagitious demagogues, as the cauſes at once of their guilt and diſgraceful puniſhment.

That you might leave no topick of inflammation of the Iriſh Romaniſts untouched, you repeat in this addreſs two calumnies

calumnies againſt the government of the country, which you have already advanced in the Houſe of Commons more than once, the falſity of which has been demonſtrated as often as you preſumed to advance them; and though you ſtood publicly convicted of deliberate malicious falſehood, in the two inſtances more than once, you with your accuſtomed effrontery, again repeat them in this addreſs; and you inſtructed your jacobin maſters in England, to retail the ſame falſehoods, for they appear in the copies of a ſpeech, publiſhed in the Engliſh prints as ſpoken by Mr. Fox on Iriſh affairs in the Engliſh houſe of commons; they are thus ſet forth in your addreſs: "They" (government) "agreed to the firſt Ca-" tholic bill, and then *proſcribed* the perſon of the Catholic, " and *oppoſed his freedom in corporations*." By the firſt Catholic bill, it is plain you mean the bill which paſſed in favour of Iriſh Romaniſts, in the year 1793, for that is the bill which enabled Romaniſts to become members of corporations, and in that particular, put them on a footing with Proteſtants, repealing the teſt and corporation acts, in their favour; in both theſe particulars of proſcription of Romaniſts, and oppoſition to their freedom in corporations, by government ſince that act, you aſſert what is not warranted by fact; I clearly expoſed the falſehood and malignity of ſuch aſſertions in my place in the Houſe of Commons in your hearing, ſtating the tranſactions on which they were founded; the ſubſtance of my ſpeech on that occaſion is in print, and it is not neceſſary here to repeat what I then ſaid; you did not then attempt to refute me; if you ſhall hereafter attempt to vindicate your aſſertions on theſe heads, and produce your pretended inſtances of proſcription, and oppoſition in corporations, I am able again to diſprove them.

Mr. Grattan's charge of corruption againſt the preſent Iriſh government refuted.

Your next charge againſt the preſent Iriſh government is corruption, you charge them with ſupporting their decided majority in parliament, againſt the meaſures of you and your petty faction, by corruption; that is, you in fact charge, that all the knights of the different ſhires in Ireland, ſix or ſeven excepted, (which are as many as I recollect, ever to have voted with you and your party, againſt the meaſures of go-

vernment on any queſtion) all the members for cities and great towns, for all open boroughs, and for what are ſtiled cloſe (that is boroughs chiefly under the patronage of great and powerful noblemen or gentlemen, having large eſtates in the country) about ten or twelve members for boroughs excepted, the whole ſtrength of your faction in the Houſe of Commons, are induced by bribery to vote againſt your meaſures; the accuſation is ſo notoriouſly unfounded, that no defence is neceſſary; the whole repreſentatives of the landed and moneyed intereſt are not, nor could they be, bribed to vote and act againſt the true intereſts of their country, that is, their own intereſts; the abſurdity of the accuſation is a ſufficient refutation; but to ſupport your accuſation you adduce two inſtances, one, that to overwhelm an oligarchical party in parliament, "a new hoſt of places and penſions, was "reſorted to, this is the famous half million, or the experi-"ment of the caſtle to ſecure the dependence of parliament, "and prevent the formation of an Iriſh party againſt the "dominion of the Britiſh Cabinet." This allegation of corruption in the government, you have founded, on an aſſertion, declared in ſeveral of your ſpeeches, to have been once made in the Houſe of Commons, by a perſon then employed in the ſervice of government; the aſſertion, as you frequently ſtated it, was, "that it had coſt government half a million "to defeat an oppoſition party, in the Houſe of Commons;" and you have frequently admitted that the tranſaction alluded to happened during the time Lord Townſhend was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland; his lieutenancy commenced in 1767 and ended in 1772, ſo that, according to you it muſt have happened, more than twenty-ſeven years ago; and that it ever happened, or that ſuch aſſertion was ever made, reſts upon *your credit*.

The miſconduct of former governors, by a kind of political legerdemain, you transfer to the preſent; but for a moment ſuppoſing that a corruption of parliament was deſigned by multiplying the lucrative offices of the ſtate, and conferring them on members of parliament, has not the place-bill lately enacted, a meaſure adopted by a miniſtry of a much

later

later date, than that of Lord Townſhend, compleatly defeated the deſign? That bill, amongſt other regulations, diſqualifies perſons, poſſeſſing a great number of lucrative offices, to ſit in parliament, many of which were heretofore filled by members of parliament; and it vacates the ſeats of all members of the Houſe of Commons, who ſhall, after their election, accept of places of profit under the crown tenable at pleaſure; add to this powerful check to corruption, the penſion bill; both theſe bills are of modern date; yet whilſt you, for the purpoſe of inflammation, load the preſent government with the imputed guilt of the miſconduct of former governors, you conceal from view the merit of the preſent or of immediately preceding governors, in correcting ſuch miſconduct, if ſuch there was, and in preventing future governors from adopting ſuch corruptive meaſures; with the ſame view, you accuſe the preſent government with creating new places for gentlemen of the law profeſſion, but you omit ſtating the abſolute neceſſity of the creation, ariſing from defect and delay in the diſpenſing of public juſtice, both criminal and civil, which occurred in almoſt all the counties in the kingdom, before they were created; and you alſo omitted, that barriſters holding ſuch new created employments, were incapacitated by the act which eſtabliſhed them to ſit in parliament; you accuſe government with a deſign to corrupt the bar by the creation of theſe places, with what juſtice I leave the world to determine; but in preferring this accuſation, you fall into a ſtrange inconſiſtency; contrary to the whole tenor of your addreſs, you ſtumble here on one truth, to wit, "That in this country formerly the rule of government was, "the law of the land," you ſtate throughout your addreſs that the whole proceedings of government in this country, from the commencement of the reign of James the firſt to the preſent day, have been a continued ſyſtem of the moſt atrocious and horrible tyranny, over the inhabitants of this kingdom, over *Iriſhmen* in large characters, that ſtrong, hardy, bold, brave, laborious, warm-hearted, and *faithful* race of men, as you deſcribe them. The law of England was not extended over all Ireland, till the reign of James the

firſt,

firſt, before that time the inhabitants of four-fifths of this kingdom, were out of the pale of the Engliſh laws, and were governed by certain barbarous cuſtoms, called the *Brehon law*, of which Sir John Davis gives ſome account; at what time was it then, "*that the rule of government in this country* "*was the law* of the land," according to *you?* The fact is certainly true, the law of the land has been always the rule of government in this country, ſince it became entirely pervious to the common law of England; but how came you, againſt your very nature and deſign, to deviate into this truth? it renders your addreſs a heap of inconſiſtency—from compaſſion to you, I will endeavour to reconcile you with yourſelf; the law you there meant, as the rule of government, was the *Brehon law* before the reign of King James the firſt: and the government, the then Iriſh chiefs or Sachems, and their Brehons or judges; what a pity that you did not live in thoſe times! you would, if then in exiſtence, have been a *Brehon*, and could I entertain the belief of tranſmigration, I ſhould certainly conclude, that your ſoul formerly animated the body of a ſturdy dogmatick Brehon, a ſupercilious and deſpotick barbarian, whoſe nod was plunder, and whoſe frown was death!

It is not here amiſs to examine whether the conduct of government, in nominating to the offices of the ſtate, members of the Houſe of Lords and Commons, can be conſidered as an effect of a ſyſtem of corruption of parliament, adopted by the crown; it is notorious that in every civilized ſtate, whether monarchical or republican, there muſt be a ſet of men, ſelected from the body of the people, whoſe peculiar province it is, to tranſact the buſineſs of the ſtate; it is highly reaſonable, and indeed neceſſary, that ſuch men ſhould be paid by the community for their trouble, for we find by experience, that the duty of laborious offices which officious men have ſometimes undertaken to perform without emolument, has been always in the end neglected or abandoned, nor is it to be expected that men will gratuitouſly expend and waſte their time and their labour. In a great empire, as is that of Britain, there muſt be many and ſkilful public offi-

cers,

cers, which from the conſtitution of our mixed monarchy, muſt be nominated by the crown; this power of nomination gives a conſiderable degree of influence to the crown, but it is a proper and conſtitutional influence, with which the very nature of our government demands that the crown ſhould be inveſted, and without which our conſtitution could not exiſt; to what body of men then is the monarch to look for a ſupply of public officers? is he to exclude from all public functions the whole Houſe of Lords, the whole body of the nobility of the nation, the hereditary council of the crown? and is he alſo to exclude all the members of the Houſe of Commons, the ableſt and moſt enlightened part of the people, partly poſſeſſing and certainly repreſenting, the whole maſs of the landed and monied intereſt in the nation; of whoſe talents, abilities, and capacity for public ſervice from their ſituation, he has the beſt opportunity of judging? and is the monarch to reſort to the jovial clubs of country ſquires, to a fox-hunt or horſe-race, to the cloiſters of a college, to the counting-houſes of traders, to the factories of weavers, the forges of ſmiths, to the plough, the loom, or the hammer, for prime miniſters, and ſecretaries of ſtate? and is the monarch in a mixed monarchy like ours, to be ſtripped of all influence of every kind in the ſenate? The man who can anſwer theſe ſeveral queſtions in the affirmative, and frame his anſwers from his own real opinion, is a perſon too abſurd to be argued with, he muſt be entirely ignorant, not only of all the œconomy of political ſociety, but of the very nature of man, conſidered as a reaſonable and a ſocial being.

You declaim, ſir, in your addreſs, with a conſiderable degree of aſperity, againſt what you call the trade of parliament, by which I underſtand, the buying a ſeat in the Houſe of Commons, for a venal borough, or procuring a ſeat in that Houſe by other means, with a view of making great advantage of the purchaſe, by compelling the miniſter to buy the talents of the purchaſer, and thereby not only to ſilence his clamorous oppoſition to all meaſures of government, right or wrong, but to employ his mercenary eloquence in a ſlaviſh ſupport of adminiſtration on all occaſions. Of theſe venal boroughs

the

the number is ſmall, and I freely admit, that ſuch trade has been driven, and ſometimes with ſucceſs; but your aſſurance in ſelecting ſuch a topick for inflammation, is ſurely unmatchable! it is a univerſally received opinion, that ſome of the moſt turbulent and clamorous *anteſignani* in your ſcanty ranks of oppoſition, ſet up in that trade of parliament, in which, thank Providence! they have failed and become bankrupts; their unhappy fate has drawn from you the moſt pathetick complaints in your addreſs. Pray which are they, or the hapleſs American loyaliſts, the greateſt objects of compaſſion in your eyes? thus you pour forth your tragick effuſion, from the very bottom of your ſoul: "What man of "ſmall fortune, what man of great fortune, can now afford "to come into the Houſe of Commons, or ſuſtain the expence "of a ſeat in parliament, or of a conteſted election? I know "ſome who have great talents, *(that is, ſtrong lungs and con-* "*ſummate aſſurance*) and have exerciſed them in the public "ſervice, are diſpoſed to decline ſituations, to the honeſt in- "dividual ſo expenſive, and to the public now ſo unprofita- "ble." (you might have added "*and to themſelves.*") But your diſappointed ſatellites, are not the only perſons who followed the trade of parliament; no man followed it in my memory with ſo much aſſiduity or ſucceſs as you yourſelf have done, ſince your commencement in that buſineſs; returned into parliament for a cloſe borough at your firſt appearance on the public ſtage, by the intereſt of a nobleman, in whoſe patronage it was, you immediately opened your ſhop, and expoſed your wares to ſale, the ſtock of a ſecond-hand retail political haberdaſher, the whole conſiſted of an aſſortment collected from the two ſtore-houſes of deceaſed politicians, the one Molyneux's State of Ireland, the other the Drapier's Letters; the Iriſh Nation at that time laboured under two grievances, the firſt a real one felt ſeverely by the public at large; the ſecond, more a theoretical than an actual grievance, though ſometimes really felt, and always menacing. The firſt conſiſted in a ſevere and impolitic reſtriction of the trade of Ireland, by the commercial regulations of Britain; the ſecond was an aſſumed power in the Britiſh legiſlature

Mr. Grattan's aſſiduity and ſucceſs in carrying on the *trade of* Parliament.

to

to bind Ireland by its ſtatutes; and to this grievance may be added, the effects of an Iriſh ſtatute called Poynings' act, by which the Iriſh parliament in its legiſlative capacity, was controlled by the great law officers in England: the nation, galled by *theſe oppreſſions*, equally pernicious and diſgraceful, loudly expreſſed on all occaſions their diſſatisfaction at them; and zealouſly applauded and ſupported as well every honeſt patriot, as political adventurer, who argued or declaimed againſt them; and as uſual in ſuch caſes, the multitude always expreſſed loudeſt their approbation of the loudeſt declaimer, meaſuring the merit of the orator by the uproar, turbulence, and fury, of his harangues. In ſuch a ſeaſon ſeveral able and honeſt ſenators ſtood forth the champions of their country, and combated theſe oppreſſions with the weapons of argument and reaſon: you joined the ranks, and fought againſt the common enemy with leſs effective execution, but with ſuperior noiſe, turbulence, and acrimony, battering them inceſſantly with the artillery of Molyneux and Swift. The campaign was ſucceſsful, the Engliſh miniſter liſtened to the voice of juſtice and reaſon, and agreed to a treaty: the grievances were redreſſed; the ports of the world were opened to the Iriſh trader, the independence of the Iriſh legiſlature on that of Britain was acknowledged; and Poynings' act repealed. The giddy multitude, captivated by the fury and bluſter of your operations, attributed the whole ſucceſs to you: and you carried away the palm from your upright, honeſt, patriotic aſſociates, with much leſs real merit, whether we conſider your abilities or motives. You were determined however to work your own emolument out of the national proſperity, and to take advantage of this tide of Iriſh exultation to bring into port a Galeon freighted with a precious cargo on your own account; though juſt ſet up in the trade of parliament, you ſeemed to have underſtood it better, than older merchants; you contrived matters ſo, that a vote was carried in the Houſe of Commons, for beſtowing on you fifty thouſand pounds out of the public purſe, as a reward for your exertions in eſtabliſhing the independence of the Iriſh legiſlature; and you had addreſs ſufficient to obtain

the

the conſent of the crown to this moſt extraordinary and unmerited donation, by your engagement in future to ſupport the meaſures of government: by a judicious diſpoſal of this money you have ſecured to yourſelf an eſtate in fee ſimple of three thouſand pounds per annum and upwards: and you, who accuſe the preſent government of corruption in the diſtribution of places and penſions, are, and for ſome years have been, in poſſeſſion of a penſion in fee ſimple of three thouſand pounds per annum, the moſt unmerited that ever was beſtowed, and purchaſed by the moſt unwarrantable, wanton, and profuſe expenditure of public money, that has ever occurred in the annals of this or the ſiſter kingdom. To expoſe in a clearer point of view the inanity of your claim to this donation, it is neceſſary here to recur to ſome part of your conduct, after receipt of that coſtly proof of public prodigality and folly. The Engliſh nation, from the time of their conqueſt of Ireland, in the reign of King Henry the ſecond, to the year 1782, had claimed and frequently exerciſed a power of legiſlating for Ireland: the claim is aſſerted in all their law books where Ireland is mentioned, particularly by Lord Coke in Calvin's caſe, and in his Inſtitutes, and may be found particularly ſtated in judge Blackſtone's Commentaries, vol. 1. p. 100, 101. In the reign of George the firſt, the claim was queſtioned by the Iriſh, and the Engliſh parliament paſſed a declaratory law in the 6th year of that reign, in which they aſſerted the power of the Britiſh Parliament to bind Ireland by its acts *as part of the common law of England.* Previous to, and in, the year 1782 the Iriſh parliament, as is before ſtated, made heavy complaints of this aſſumed power of the Britiſh parliament, to legiſlate for Ireland; and a bill paſſed in the Britiſh parliament repealing this declaratory act, in conſequence of theſe complaints, by way of contenting the Iriſh nation; the late Mr. Flood, and ſome other leading members in the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, ſaw clearly, that ſuch repeal of a declaratory act, did not abrogate the law as it ſtood before that act was made; and that if by the common law of England, as laid down by their moſt eminent lawyers, Ireland was bound

bound by Britiſh acts of parliament before the enacting of that declaratory act, the repeal of that act left the law as it ſtood before; and that the right of binding Ireland by Britiſh acts, might be again, not only claimed, but exerciſed, by the parliament of Britain, whenever they ſhould think it convenient to do ſo, and Mr. Flood and others inſiſted in the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, that the repeal of the act of the 6th of George the firſt, did not, and could not, eſtabliſh and ſecure the independence of the parliament of Ireland, and that nothing ſhort of an act of renunciation by the Britiſh parliament of all right of legiſlating for Ireland, could eſtabliſh or ſecure that independence.

Mr. Grattan violently oppoſed the act of renunciation, which alone could ſecure the independence of the Iriſh legiſlature, and his reaſons for ſo doing.

To this moſt reaſonable doctrine of Mr. Flood, and the gentlemen who ſupported his opinion, you oppoſed yourſelf with all your wonted fury and acrimony in the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, and abſurdly inſiſted, that the ſimple repeal of a declaratory act abrogated the law which was antecedent to the act; your obſtinacy on this occaſion was exactly in proportion to your abſurdity. However the Britiſh parliament concurred in opinion with Mr. Flood, and paſſed an act of renunciation of all power of legiſlation for Ireland.

It was matter of wonder to men who had been carried away by the torrent of popular applauſe, and looked upon you as a zealous aſſertor of the independence of the Iriſh legiſlature, to ſee you thus vehemently oppoſing the only meaſure which could eſtabliſh and ſecure it; but their wonder ceaſed, when they found that the concurrence of the miniſter of the day, with the commons, in preſenting to you fifty thouſand pounds, without whoſe concurrence you could not have touched the money, had been purchaſed by your engagement to ſupport his meaſures: and that he reſiſted the idea of renunciation at that time, not knowing how the parliament of Britain might feel on ſo momentous a meaſure; if that miniſter is now living, and has read your addreſs, when he came to this paſſage, "*no—no—no—the half million*, "*ſaid the miniſter, this is my principle of attraction: among the* "*rich I ſend my half million*," how muſt he bluſh at his own folly in beſtowing on you, one ſolitary repreſentative of a

cloſe

cloſe borough, without eſtate, family or connexions to make you conſiderable, one full tenth part of that ſum, which you repreſent as ſufficient to corrupt the whole Iriſh ſenate, fifty thouſand pounds! and what tortures muſt he feel, when he finds his accomplice has turned approver againſt him! Imagination paints him to me on ſuch occaſion crying out with Macheath, "That Jemmy Twitcher ſhould peach me!" or with the Roman poet, "*Clodius accuſat mœchos, Catilina Ce-*" *thegum!*"*

Mr. Grattain violently oppoſed a parliamentary cenſure, on a libel publiſhed in England, purporting to be a copy of a ſpeech of Mr. Fox in the Britiſh Houſe of Commons on the ſtate of Ireland.

The next tranſaction of your political life which it is neceſſary here to mention, is your conduct in the laſt ſeſſion, when the extraordinary attack ſtated in the public prints to have been made in the Britiſh Houſe of Commons by Mr. Fox on the proceedings of the Iriſh Parliament, was animadverted upon in the Iriſh Houſe of Commons. A falſe and infamous libel on the Iriſh parliament, particularly on the Houſe of Commons, was publiſhed in moſt of the London newſpapers in the month of March, in the year 1797, and from them copied into the republican Iriſh prints, entitled Mr. Fox's ſpeech on the ſtate of Ireland, and purporting to be a copy of a ſpeech made in the Engliſh Houſe of Commons by Mr. Fox. This libel, after ſtating a variety of the moſt malignant and groundleſs falſehoods, reſpecting Ireland, the diſpoſitions of its inhabitants, and meaſures purſued by government there, proceeded to condemn in a rancorous invective, the rejection of the two meaſures by the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, which your addreſs mentions as panaceas propoſed by you and your party for the cures of all popular diſcontents in Ireland, to wit, *emancipation and reform.* For the firſt of theſe meaſures, there appeared on a diviſion in the Iriſh Houſe of Commons twenty votes only: and as your party joined emancipation and reform together, declaring that emancipation was only the firſt part of reform, and that there

* The French directory, conſiſting of five perſons, demanded as a bribe from the American ambaſſadors, the ſum of fifty thouſand pounds; they were contented with ten thouſand pounds a-piece. Our Iriſh ſham patriot is not contented with a leſs ſum than fifty thouſand pounds for himſelf. Mock patriotiſm is a more productive profeſſion in Ireland, than in France!

there could be no reform without emancipation, the deciſion of the Houſe, almoſt unanimous, againſt emancipation, put an end to diviſions of the Houſe on the ſtring of reſolutions you had prepared reſpecting the remainder of your ſcheme of reform; many of the twenty who voted for emancipation, declaring they would vote againſt all the remainder of the propoſed reform. This libel, publiſhed as the ſpeech of Mr. Fox, ſtated this almoſt unanimous deciſion of the Iriſh Houſe of Commons to have been procured by the influence of the crown, and repreſented the members of that Houſe as only puppets of the miniſter, including in this cenſure all the Iriſh repreſentatives of counties, cities and boroughs: it aſſerted the propriety of the interference of the Engliſh Houſe of Commons with the proceedings of the Iriſh parliament; and of their entertaining and examining the merits of appeals made by any defeated party in the Iriſh Commons, be it ever ſo inſignificant, and reverſing the deciſions of the Iriſh parliament in all matters of internal legiſlation of that country, on two principles, one, that if a rebellion ſhould blaze up in Ireland in conſequence of meaſures purſued by the Iriſh parliament, there were no other means to extinguiſh it, except Engliſh forces and money, which could be only levied by the authority of the Engliſh Commons. The other, that the Iriſh parliament was an engine, entirely worked and directed by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and his ſecretary, who were tools of the Engliſh miniſtry, which miniſtry was accountable to, and controlable by, the Engliſh Houſe of Commons. The laſt of theſe principles, if admitted, would at once deſtroy all idea of independent legiſlation in Ireland: but it is ſo notoriouſly falſe that no arguments are neceſſary to confute it. The firſt principle is alſo generally falſe, as there is force ſufficient in Ireland of loyal Iriſh ſubjects, to quell any rebellion which may blaze forth from the fuel furniſhed by you and your party; but were it neceſſary, in caſe of an Iriſh rebellion, to obtain aſſiſtance in men and money from England, the furniſhing ſuch aſſiſtance would give no more right to the Engliſh Houſe of Commons to legiſlate for Ireland, than the furniſhing of ſimilar aſſiſtance by Ireland

to

to quell a rebellion in Britain, would give to the Iriſh Houſe of Commons to legiſlate for Britain; and the libel ſtated, that Mr. Fox had made a motion in the Engliſh Houſe of Commons, for an addreſs to his Majeſty to change his miniſters in Ireland, which he prefaced with this ſpeech, and that the whole oppoſition party had ſupported this motion, which however was rejected in the Britiſh Houſe of Commons, by a great majority.

When this libel was publiſhed, ſome members of the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, one of whom I was, thought it proper to ſtamp it with ſome ſignal mark of diſgrace; it contained ſo many acrimonious falſehoods reſpecting the government, parliament, and Proteſtants of Ireland; and urged a doctrine ſo deſtructive of the very idea of independent Iriſh legiſlation, or as you ſtile it in your addreſs, ſelf-legiſlation, that we thought it merited the utmoſt reprobation; and with that view, I produced the libel, as publiſhed in the Morning Chronicle, an Engliſh newſpaper, in the Iriſh Houſe of Commons: I expoſed its malignity and falſehood; and moved that it ſhould be read by the clerk at the table; which motion I intended to have followed with two others, one for a vote of the Houſe, declaring it a falſe, ſcandalous and malicious libel on the Iriſh nation and parliament, and particularly on the Houſe of Commons; and another, for a vote condemning it to be burned by the common hangman at the door of the Houſe. But the Houſe were of opinion, that the motion, ſaid to have been prefaced by this libel having been rejected by the Britiſh Houſe of Commons, they were not called upon to take any notice of it, as the doctrines contained in it, were ſufficiently reprobated by ſuch rejection; and my firſt motion was loſt by a previous queſtion which put an end to the buſineſs. On this occaſion you defended the libel, and its doctrines, with the utmoſt violence of voice, expreſſion and geſture: you roundly aſſerted the propriety of appeals from the parliament of Ireland to the Britiſh Houſe of Commons, and you attempted to vindicate and ſupport many of the falſehoods and miſrepreſentations contained in it; you were ſo tranſported with rage at what you conſidered an attack on

your

your jacobin maſters in England, that you became almoſt unintelligible, and as moſt of the falſehoods and miſrepreſentations contained in it are repeated in your preſent addreſs, it is not difficult to trace this libel on the Iriſh government, nation and parliament, to its true ſource; it is certain, if ſuch ſpeech was actually ſpoken in the Britiſh Houſe of Commons, that the materials muſt have been furniſhed by you, and that the falſehoods contained in it, are not imputable to the Speaker, though his extreme credulity, in taking ſo readily upon truſt the unſupported aſſertions of a deſperate, diſappointed, dogmatic, political railer, is juſtly blameable.

And now, ſir, ſee how the account of political integrity and conſiſtency ſtands with you. You received fifty thouſand pounds for aſſerting the independence of the Iriſh legiſlature on that of Britain: you immediately afterwards oppoſed the neceſſity of renunciation of the power of legiſlating for Ireland on the part of Britain, the only meaſure which could annihilate ſuch power and eſtabliſh and ſecure the independence of Iriſh legiſlation. In your preſent addreſs you preach up the doctrine of the neceſſity of ſelf-legiſlation, as you have often done before; yet in the very laſt ſeſſion of parliament, you maintained with all your power, and with the utmoſt violence, the juſtice and propriety of the Engliſh Houſe of Commons interfering in matters of internal legiſlation in Ireland, and dictating to the Iriſh parliament what meaſures they ſhould purſue, and what laws they ſhould enact, and that if the Iriſh parliament ſhould decline, even unanimouſly, the adoption of ſuch meaſures, and enaction of ſuch laws, it was fit and proper that the Engliſh Houſe of Commons ſhould exerciſe an appellatory juriſdiction over the deciſions of the parliament of Ireland, reverſe them at their pleaſure, and take proper ſteps to compel them to adopt meaſures directly contrary to ſuch deciſions. Such has been in the laſt ſeſſion your ſupport of the doctrine of ſelf-legiſlation! Your conduct on theſe occaſions puts me in mind of that of a party in the Iriſh commons in the year 1640, compoſed of Romaniſts and Puritans, the conſtituent

parts

parts of the faction of which you at preſent aſſume the ſtation of leader. Such party prevailed on the Houſe of Commons of Ireland, ſo far to betray their own independence, as to ſend a petition by two agents, Mr. Bellew and Mr. Caſhell, to the Houſe of Commons of England, praying them to redreſs the then pretended grievances of Ireland, which petition was preſented on the 13th of November 1640, at the bar of the Engliſh Houſe of Commons, ſee Carte's Ormond, 1ſt vol. p. 115; the Iriſh Houſe of Commons of that day, agreed to ſuch petition; you could not perſuade the Iriſh Commons in 1797 to be guilty of a ſimilar piece of treachery to the nation. You and a few, a very few others only of that Houſe in 1797, were found mean enough to contend for a controlling power in the Britiſh commons over the parliament of your country, at the very time you pretended to aſſert its right of ſelf-legiſlation.

Having thus, ſir, in general remarked on the flagitious tendency of your addreſs, and the more prominent falſehoods and miſrepreſentations contained in it, and expoſed the true cauſes of the nocturnal murders and robberies, which of late have diſgraced the country, I ſhall now take the liberty of adverting to the two meaſures which you ſtate to be the only methods by which theſe diſorders can be ſuppreſſed; which meaſures, with equal fraud and falſehood, you are pleaſed to dignify with the titles of *emancipation* and *reform;* and I ſhall make a few obſervations on the arguments by which you have attempted to ſupport the neceſſity of them. I hope to make it clear to every reader, that by the firſt you really mean the ſubverſion of the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment in church and ſtate; and by the ſecond, a republican government ſeparated from, and independent of Great Britain; which I ſhall demonſtrate, would, if attempted, be attended by the deſolation of the kingdom; and that ſucceſs in ſuch a meaſure, would only perpetuate deſolation and miſery.

Mr. Grattan's arguments in favour of emancipation; remarks on

I ſhall begin this part of my anſwer, with obſervations on your arguments, or rather rhapſody, in ſupport of what you term Catholic emancipation. You commence your arguments (if ſuch they can be called) with ſtating "that the "ſentiments

" ſentiments and the principles of the Iriſh Romaniſts, have
" ſuffered a mighty change, that the Iriſh Romaniſt of the
" preſent day, does not hold the ſame ſentiments and opi-
" nions held by the Romaniſts in the year 1692, and that
" the revolution in America had worked a prodigious alte-
" ration in the political opinions of the Romaniſts of Ireland."
Now, ſir, admitting all this to be fact, I cannot conceive
how you can apply it as an argument in favour of aboliſhing
the teſts, by the refuſal of which, the Iriſh Romaniſts pre-
clude themſelves from ſitting in parliament, and from filling
the great offices of ſtate; as to all other privileges they are
already fully on a level with their Proteſtant fellow ſubjects:
all it amounts to is this; the American revolution has made
all the Iriſh Romaniſts of the preſent day republicans; in
1692 they were royaliſts; therefore in the preſent political
ſituation of Europe, it is politic in the governors of the
Britiſh Empire to transfer the powers of the ſtate in Ireland,
a kingdom dependant upon the imperial crown of Great
Britain, from the Iriſh Proteſtants, attached loyaliſts, faith-
ful ſubjects, to Iriſh Romaniſts, all republicans, and ready to
follow the example of revolted America. You indeed mark
the alteration in the ſentiments and principles of Romaniſts,
which you aſſert to have happened, thus: " With the Iriſh
" Catholics of the year 1792, the influence of pope,
" prieſt and pretender, is at an end," inſinuating that the
impoſition of excluſive teſts on Iriſh Romaniſts, aroſe from
ſuch influence, which rendered them inimical to the preſent
eſtabliſhment in church and ſtate; the firſt part of your aſ-
ſertion is eaſily proved not to be fact, to wit, that the influ-
ence of the pope and prieſt over the Iriſh Romaniſts, is at an
end; the ſecond I admit to be true; but the influence of a
principle full as hoſtile to the conſtitution has ſucceeded, to
wit, the influence of pure democratic republicaniſm. That
the Iriſh Romaniſts, whom you call the *popular and energetic*
part of them, (with which Iriſh Romaniſts alone you are
connected, and whoſe ſentiments and opinions you con-
ſtantly obtrude on the public, as thoſe of the whole body of
Iriſh Romaniſts) are ſtaunch republicans, and ſeparatiſts from

and refuta-
tion of
them.

Great Britain, has been frequently acknowledged and avowed by them, in a great variety of publications; amongſt others by the laboured account of their proceedings, ſpeeches and reſolutions, when aſſembled at the Romiſh chapel in Francis-ſtreet, on the 9th of April, 1795, as I have before mentioned. Separation from Britain is a diſavowal of all allegiance to his majeſty, and as there is now no pretender, the Stewart line being extinct, and as the aſſiſtance of the French republic is abſolutely neceſſary for effecting a ſeparation, the eſtabliſhment of a republican form of government in Ireland, muſt be the natural conſequence of ſuch ſeparation. Ever ſince the decline of the Spaniſh monarchy, the Iriſh Romaniſts have looked to the French, as the only nation which could enable them to ſeparate themſelves from Britain, and to eſtabliſh an independent government: they attached themſelves to the houſe of Stewart, as I have already obſerved, merely becauſe the French monarch favoured that houſe; and they hoped by the intereſt of the Stewart race, with the monarch of France, to procure from France aids ſufficient to effect their only purpoſe, ſeparation; they were then obliged from intereſted motives only, to affect an attachment to monarchy; but the Stewart race being extinct, and the government of France changed to a republic, the Iriſh Romaniſts immediately adopted republican principles, (I mean here only thoſe you ſtile the *popular and energetic* part of them) as moſt agreeable to the ruling powers in France, who on that account would be more ready to aſſiſt them; and ſeparation from Britain being their only object, they were ready to embrace republicaniſm, the moment it appeared to them to conduce to the attainment of that object. The abſurd argument which I have often heard advanced in favour of the claims of Iriſh Romaniſts to political power in our ſtate, *that the Romiſh religion attaches thoſe of its communion to a monarchical government*, has been ſufficiently refuted of late by their own writers; they perhaps were afraid that ſuch arguments would do them miſchief with the preſent ruling powers in France, and delay or impede ſuccours from that country, for effecting a ſeparation, they therefore

therefore took ſome pains to prove that the Romiſh religion ſuited a republic full as well as a monarchy. Some Romiſh prieſts, very eminent in their ſtations amongſt perſons of that communion, have taken care to diſtinguiſh themſelves on this topic. Their titular biſhops, under the pretence of publiſhing paſtoral letters, have publiſhed pamphlets highly inflammatory and ſeditious, particularly a man of the name of *Huſſey*, who has informed us in his pamphlet publiſhed in January, 1797, that he had been recently appointed biſhop of Waterford by the pope. This man, a native of Ireland, but educated in ſome Spaniſh ſeminary or convent, was brought back to this kingdom by Earl Fitzwilliam, for the avowed purpoſe of placing him at the head of a ſeminary, to be eſtabliſhed here, for the education of Romiſh prieſts: this deſign has been ſince the recal of Earl Fitzwilliam carried into effect: and grants have been obtained from parliament for that purpoſe amounting to nearly thirty-ſix thouſand pounds, more than half as much of the public money as was formerly ſquandered upon you; and Mr. Huſſey has been made the preſident of this ſeminary. Notwithſtanding this man's obligations to government, he publiſhed a pamphlet at the time before mentioned, entitled, "A Paſtoral Letter to the Catholic Clergy of the united dioceſes of Waterford and Liſmore, by the Right Reverend Doctor Huſſey." As the great maſs of Iriſh property real and perſonal, is in the hands of Proteſtants, this writer in the firſt place inſerts this injunction, to his ſubordinate prieſts: "Do not permit yourſelves to be made the inſtruments of "the rich of this world, (i. e. the Proteſtants) who will try "by adulation, and poſſibly by other means, to make inſtruments of you, over the poor (i. e. the Romaniſts) for "their own temporal purpoſes, and perhaps to render your "ſacred miniſtry odious to them. The poor were always "your friends—they inflexibly adhered to you, and to their "religion, even in the worſt of times. They ſhared their "ſcanty meal with you and with your predeceſſors; and "thereby preſerved a ſucceſſion of ſpiritual paſtors throughout the kingdom; if they had acted otherwiſe, conformed

Romiſh titular biſhops in Ireland have publiſhed ſeditious libels, under the title of paſtoral letters: particularly one Huſſey, a Romiſh prieſt, imported into Ireland by Earl Fitzwilliam.

" to the *errors* of the nation (i. e. the Proteſtant religion) " and imitated the conduct of the *rich*, who not only ſhut " their doors againſt you, but not *unfrequently hunted you* " *like wild beaſts*, I ſhould not be able to addreſs the preſent " reſpectable body of clergy, under my ſpiritual authority." He then proceeds to reprobate all Proteſtant places of education, and particularly the charter-ſchools eſtabliſhed by royal authority, where the children of ſuch Romaniſts as pleaſe to ſend them, are educated and maintained gratis, in the following words: " Remonſtrate with any parent, who " will be ſo criminal as to expoſe his offspring to thoſe places " of education, where his religious faith or morals are " likely to be perverted. If he will not attend to your re- " monſtrances, refuſe him the participation of Chriſt's body: " if he ſhould ſtill continue obſtinate, denounce him to " the church, (i. e. excommunicate him) in order that ac- " cording to Chriſt's commandment, he be conſidered as " a heathen and publican." After thus, as far as lay in his power, cutting off all friendly intercourſe between Iriſhmen of different religious perſuaſions, and drawing as ſtrong a line of ſeparation between them as he poſſibly could, Mr. Huſſey proceeds thus: " If in any of your diſtricts, the " Catholic military frequent Proteſtant places of worſhip, it " is your duty to expoſtulate with them, and to teach them " how contrary to the principles of the Catholic faith it is, " exteriorly to profeſs one *faith* and interiorly to believe ano- " ther: an Iriſh ſoldier, ought not to be aſhamed of openly " profeſſing the Catholic religion—*the religion of Iriſhmen*," (in Italics) " inſtruct them, that in all matters regarding " the ſervice of the king, their officers are competent to " command them, and that they are bound to obey; but in " matters regarding the ſervice of the King of kings, *their* " *officers have no authority over them.* The many compulſory " means lately employed, (and ſeveral inſtances of them " within this very dioceſe, not many days ſince) to drive the " Catholic military to Proteſtant places of worſhip, alarmed " the *true*" (in Italics) " friends to the king and his ſervice, " and every well-wiſher to the peace and quiet of the coun-

" try.

" try. Such unwarrantable ſteps could not make proſelytes " of the Catholic military—it might, in time, make them " indifferent to all forms of worſhip, and thereby jaco- " binize them on the French ſcale, and perhaps in the hour " of danger, induce them to forget their duty, and their " loyalty, *in order to be revenged of their perſecutors.*" The dangerous and malignant tendency of this laſt paſſage cannot be fully explained, without adverting to a few facts. It is a practice with the military in Ireland, when quartered in towns in which there are churches, to call forth the ſoldiers, on the ſabbath day on the parade, and to march them to the church; when at the church door, ſuch of them as are Proteſtants enter and attend divine ſervice; the reſt are diſmiſſed, generally with an admonition to repair to their reſpective places of worſhip: and no Romiſh ſoldier is ever ordered or compelled to enter a Proteſtant church, and attend during the celebration of divine ſervice. A man of the name of Hyland, a private ſoldier in a regiment of dragoons, refuſed to attend the parade of his regiment on a Sunday morning, alledging that he was a Roman Catholic, and that he would not march with the regiment to the church door; he was told, that his marching with his regiment to the church door from the parade, was a military duty, with which he was bound to comply, and that he had full liberty to depart from the church door, and go to a Romiſh chapel, or where elſe he pleaſed; this did not content him, he perſiſted in his refuſal to obey his officer, he was tried by a court-martial, condemned to be whipped, and being a worthleſs ill diſpoſed fellow, he was afterwards turned out of the regiment. *Your popular and energetic Romaniſts*, about this time, were very active in obſtructing the recruiting of his majeſty's army deſtined to act againſt their friends the French, and with that view, they framed a lying ſtory from this tranſaction reſpecting Hyland, and publiſhed in all their ſcandalous prints, that Hyland, a Romiſh ſoldier, had been cruelly whipped, for refuſing to attend the celebration of divine ſervice in a Proteſtant church. The calumny was recited in the ſpeech of M'Nevin, on the 9th of April, 1795, at

Francis-

Francis-ſtreet chapel; however this ſtory might have operated on the bulk of the lower order of Romaniſts, and prevented their enliſting in his majeſty's ſervice, it ought not to have had any operation on Mr. Huſſey, for he knew, from his own experience, that Romiſh ſoldiers were not compelled to attend the celebration of divine ſervice in Proteſtant churches, and were not prevented from attending it in chapels frequented by thoſe of their own communion. He aſſerted that he had a commiſſion from the pope to act as chief almoner or chaplain to all the Romiſh military in Ireland: and the government of the country indulged him in the liberty of viſiting at his pleaſure, the camp at Lehaunſtown, near Dublin, in which ſeveral regiments were quartered, moſtly militia, many of the private ſoldiers of which were Romaniſts. Here he was permitted freely to exerciſe his functions as a Romiſh prieſt, frequently celebrating maſs, and preaching, without any interruption in the camp, although there were three Romiſh chapels in the neighbourhood, to which the Romiſh ſoldiery had free acceſs on every neceſſary occaſion; yet this man, to give ſome colour to his publication of this incendiary pamphlet under the title of a paſtoral letter, ſtates that there were ſeveral inſtances within the dioceſe of Waterford, not many days before his publication, of compulſory means being uſed to drive the Catholic military to Proteſtant places of worſhip; though being urged to mention theſe inſtances, he could not produce one. The county Fermanagh regiment of militia, when this pretended paſtoral letter was publiſhed in Waterford, was quartered in that city. The commanding officer was informed, that Mr. Huſſey had ſaid, that theſe inſtances of compulſion had happened in that regiment; the Romiſh ſoldiers in the regiment were very few; and he ordered immediate enquiry to be made, whether any ſuch compulſion had been practiſed on any ſoldiers in the regiment, and being anſwered in the negative, he and his officers wrote a very civil card to Mr. Huſſey, then in Waterford, requeſting that he would let them know, whether, in his letter, he alluded to any occurrence, which he might have heard had happened in the

Fermanagh

Fermanagh regiment; aſſuring him at the ſame time, that no compulſory means had been employed, to drive any Romiſh ſoldier in that regiment, to a Proteſtant place of worſhip. To this card Mr. Huſſey never condeſcended to write an anſwer: and the officers of the regiment, after waiting ſome time for an anſwer, publiſhed their card in the daily newſpapers. The truth is, Mr. Huſſey declined all anſwer, perfectly conſcious that he had publiſhed a falſehood reſpecting the military, and being unwilling to acknowledge it, and apologize for it, even on the ſcore of miſinformation, becauſe ſuch acknowledgment would defeat the end for which he had invented it, to wit, to awake and encourage diſcontent amongſt the ſoldiery, and diſinclination to the ſervice. If Mr. Huſſey in ſtating that compulſory methods had been employed to drive the Catholic military to Proteſtant places of worſhip meant, that the Romiſh ſoldiers were obliged to attend on the parades on Sunday mornings, and from thence march to the doors of Proteſtant churches with their Proteſtant fellow ſoldiers, the performance of ſuch military duty no way interfered with their religious perſuaſion, as they were not obliged to enter the church, and attend the celebration of divine ſervice within it, but were always diſmiſſed at the door; and Mr. Huſſey could in ſuch proceeding find no cauſe of complaint. It is plain then, when he complains of force being employed to drive the Catholic military to Proteſtant places of worſhip, he meant that the Romiſh ſoldiers were forced to attend to the celebration of divine ſervice in Proteſtant churches, which as I before obſerved is a direct falſehood.

Mr. Huſſey then proceeds to clear the Iriſh Romaniſts from the imputation of being royaliſts, which he conſiders a groundleſs calumny on that body of people: he even aims at eloquence on this topick, and thus declaims: "As the Ca-
"tholic faith is a religion preached to all nations, and to all
"people; ſo it is ſuitable to all climes, and all forms of go-
"vernment—monarchies or republics—ariſtocracies or de-
"mocracies; deſpotic or popular governments are not the
"concerns of the Catholic faith. It may well ſuit a ſmall

"ſect

" ſect (meaning the Proteſtant religion) to regulate its creed " and form of worſhip, according to the ſhape or form of " government, of the limited boundaries where that ſect " aroſe, exiſts, and dies away. Not ſo the religion, which " the prophet foretold ſhould extend from the riſing, to the " ſetting ſun, it is therefore called the Catholic or uni- " verſal religion." But Mr. Huſſey does not cloſe his paſtoral inſtructions here, he endeavours, with all his powers, to inflame the Iriſh Romaniſts againſt their Proteſtant countrymen by a picture of the condition of Iriſh Romaniſts whilſt the Popery laws were in force, blazoned and embelliſhed with the boldeſt ſtrokes and moſt glaring colours of falſehood and malice, and ſubſcribed by a menace, of ſo inſolent and daring a nature, that I cannot help exclaiming with the Roman poet,

Quid domini facient, audent cum talia fures!

When paſtor Huſſey and his flock of United Iriſhmen, with ſuch menaces already in their mouths, ſhall become our maſters, what are we to expect! Thus proceeds this *Romiſh prieſt rampant:* " If the conduct of the Catholic laity has always been loyal " and peaceable, even in the worſt of times,—if even when " religious penalties made them total ſtrangers in their " native land—if when the ruling party" (that is, the Proteſtants) " with inſolence in their looks, and oppreſſion in " their hands, ground them down—when ſome of the moſt " powerful men in the nation declared in the ſenate, that " they hoped to ſee the day when no Catholic would dare " to ſpeak to a Proteſtant with his hat on—when even the " courſe of juſtice was perverted, and the channel of it dried " up, according to the prejudices and party views of the " judges who ſat upon the bench, and were paid for the " impartial adminiſtration of it, by taxes levied on the op- " preſſed ſufferers." And then after ſtating that ſome of theſe Popery laws had been lately repealed, he continues, " That however a *junto*" (in large letters) " for their own " intereſted or their ſiniſter views, may raiſe *mobs* to try to " throw obſtacles againſt the total repeal of them, yet all " their

" their efforts muſt be uſeleſs—*the vaſt rock is already detached*
" *from the mountain's brow, and whoever ſhall oppoſe its deſcent*
" *and removal, muſt be cruſhed by his own raſh endeavours.*"
And he does not conclude this malignant inflammatory libel, without overſtepping all bounds of truth, in the moſt notorious manner, to encourage the Iriſh Romaniſts, already goaded by recitals of invented, aggravated, and magnified oppreſſions, to revolt, by multiplying their relative number to that of Proteſtants, and ſtating, " That nine tenths of
" the nation at large, and ninety nine hundredths of the
" dioceſes of Waterford and Liſmore, are ſtill faithful and
" ſteady Catholics, notwithſtanding what they and their an-
" ceſtors ſuffered for their fidelity, and for which they are
" as unrivalled in the hiſtory of the church, as inſulated an
" exception to the prevaricating verſatility of man, *as the*
" *geographical ſituation of the iſland itſelf is to the reſt of the*
" *world.*"

The reflexions thrown out in this performance againſt the Proteſtant anceſtors of the preſent race of Iriſh Proteſtants, for enacting that code of laws ſtiled Popery laws—againſt the laws themſelves—and againſt the judges who adminiſtered them, require ſome obſervations; as well as the aſſertion that the conduct of the Romiſh laity of Ireland has been always loyal and peaceable, even in the worſt of times; I have already obſerved that the ſuperficial contents of Britain bear to thoſe of Ireland the proportion of three and a half to one. Britain altogether is certainly better peopled in proportion than Ireland, but ſuppoſing it equally peopled, its population muſt be to that of Ireland in the proportion of ſeven to two. The Romaniſts in Britain do not amount to a two hundredth part of its inhabitants: in eſtimating the relative numbers of inhabitants they are of no account: of the inhabitants of Ireland not more than two thirds are Romaniſts, as has been often fully proved, the reſt are Proteſtants. So that in the population of the Britiſh Empire in Europe, the Proteſtants are to the Romaniſts, in the proportion of about twenty three to four, or nearly ſix to one, which is the fair way of counting the relative number of different religious perſuaſions

ſuaſions in a great Empire, from which to draw concluſions of the propriety of political predominancy of one over the other: and not from partial calculations of the numbers in particular diſtricts of that empire, the ſophiſtical method of argument adopted by you, ſir, and your aſſociates, when you urge the propriety of Romiſh predominancy in Ireland, and of aboliſhing the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment.

The Iriſh Romaniſts in four deſperate and general rebellions, againſt their ſovereign, each attended by the deſolation of the kingdom, attempted to eſtabliſh the Romiſh religion in Ireland, and a government ſeparated from, and independent on Britain; to wit, Deſmond's, Tyrone's, Sir Phelim O Neil's, and that which ended in the year 1691. In all theſe they were ſubdued by the united efforts of the Proteſtant ſubjects of the Empire, Engliſh, Scotch and Iriſh. Such has been the loyalty of the Iriſh Romaniſts, aſſerted by Mr. Huſſey to have always continued, even in the worſt of times; it ſeems loyalty and rebellion are ſynonimous terms in his vocabulary. After the cloſe of the laſt rebellion in 1691, very great numbers of the Iriſh Romaniſts, having entered into the ſervice of the French nation, then, and ever ſince, hoſtile to the Britiſh Empire; the Proteſtants of the Empire, haraſſed by ſo many rebellions of the Iriſh Romaniſts, which ſprouted out in ſucceſſion like Hydra's heads, and perceiving that the body of Iriſh Romaniſts in the ſervice of France, was conſtantly recruited from Ireland, and that their hoſtile diſpoſition to the Proteſtants had by no means ceaſed, but would infallibly excite them to a new rebellion, as ſoon as their recruited ſtrength, like the renovated locks of Sampſon, and the encreaſing power of the French monarchy, could inſpire them with any hopes of ſucceſs; found it abſolutely neceſſary to adopt ſuch meaſures, and enact ſuch laws, as ſeemed beſt calculated to prevent the repetition of ſuch convulſions, which had been before fatal to multitudes of Iriſh ſubjects, Romaniſts as well as Proteſtants, and highly calamitous to all; from ſuch conſiderations ſprung the popery laws, they were founded on neceſſity and reaſon, and nothing can demonſtrate the wiſdom and expediency of them

ſo

ſo much, as that whilſt they remained part of the laws of the land, the Romaniſts, reſident in Ireland, if not loyal in ſentiment, were paſſively loyal, and remained perfectly quiet; becauſe they dared not be otherwiſe; during that period, we never heard of unlawful Romiſh conventions, nor of traitorous ſpeeches made at unlawful aſſemblies in Romiſh Chapels; we never heard of a Romiſh banditti ſtiled *United Iriſhmen*, nor of their nightly aſſaſſinations and depredations; all theſe are the bleſſed fruits of the repeal of that code, as are the inflammatory, menacing, and ranting harangues and publications of you, ſir, of your colleague Tone, and of the Romiſh Prieſt, Huſſey, the chaplain and emiſſary of the Marquis Del Campo, who whilſt employed in the honourable office of Spaniſh embaſſador in England, acted the diſhonourable part of ſpy to the French Jacobins then at war with the Britiſh Empire. This prieſt is the precious importation of Earl Fitzwilliam, whoſe Prime Miniſter you were; it is pretty plain that you are well acquainted with Mr. Huſſey, for your ſentiments in your addreſs, correſpond exactly with his, in his paſtoral; you have even imitated his ſtile; the ſame pauſes, the ſame interjections, and the ſame dogmatick ſentences; nay you have gone farther: as he interlarded his performance with quotations from ſcripture, and ornamented it with all the canting hypocritical garb of the Cromwellian fanaticks, ſo you have condeſcended to inſert in your addreſs alluſions to the ſacred writings, nay to honour them with the title of *holy writ*. I adviſe you, ſir, to take care—be more on your guard—perhaps ſome of your ſtaunchest adherents may ſuſpect you of Chriſtianity, and begin to think, that you are not ſo found a French philoſopher, as you have heretofore profeſſed to be. Such opinion, ſir, would injure your reputation for ſincerity with your aſſociates in the cauſe in which you are embarked: what would your colleague Tone, ſay? I certainly, ſir, entertain no ſuch ſuſpicion of you, however, I give you this hint, *fas eſt et ab hoſte doceri*. I will ſo far humble myſelf, ſir, in your opinion, as to confeſs that I am a ſincere chriſtian in theory; I am one of thoſe perſons, whom you ridicule in your addreſs, under

under the name of Dreamers; whoſe underſtandings are at a ſtand, and whoſe principles of civil government, loyalty, and religion, being long ſince rooted in that ſtationary underſtanding, are by no means ſhaken or influenced by the revolutions of America or France. The glaring miſrepreſentations of the behaviour of Iriſh Proteſtants to their Romiſh countrymen, whilſt ſubject to the regimen of popery laws; and the falſe and infamous reflexions on the judges of the land, ſtated in the laſt paragraphs I have quoted of this pretended paſtoral letter, are all calculated to revive old animoſities, and inflame the hatred, which the native Iriſh are known to harbour, againſt all Engliſhmen and Proteſtants; and it muſt be confeſſed the Prieſt is an adept in the ſcience of exaſperating aggravation, and a very proper and able agent for the Marquis Del Campo who now is, or lately was, Spaniſh embaſſador at Paris. One ſtroke of his reſpecting the judges of the land is worthy of particular remark; he ſtates that they denied juſtice to all Iriſh Romaniſts, though they were paid for the impartial adminiſtration of it, by taxes levied on the oppreſſed ſufferers; by the calculations lately made relating to the tax of hearth-money, it was computed that there were in Ireland two millions one hundred thouſand perſons who were ſo poor, that they could not pay the hearth-money tax, at leaſt without the greateſt hardſhip: and that numbers of them on that account were excuſed from the payment. Theſe two millions one hundred thouſand were the inhabitants of wretched habitations, called cabins, in each of which there was only one fire hearth, and the tax (if levied) would amount in the year to four-pence per head only; of theſe, nine-tenths at leaſt were Romaniſts, in fact they were the bulk of the Iriſh Romaniſts, and theſe people were chargeable with no other tax whatſoever, and therefore their contribution to the expences of the ſtate, in which are included the ſalaries of the judges, could have been very little indeed? It is here to be obſerved, that all laws which peculiarly affected Iriſh Romaniſts in their reſtrictions or proviſions have been repealed, and that an Iriſh Romaniſt is now in every reſpect on an equality in point of privilege with

an

an Iriſh Proteſtant, ſave that the teſt required to be taken by all members of the Houſes of Lords and Commons, and by about 30 of the great officers of ſtate, excludes them from parliament and from theſe offices, as they refuſe to take it. Mr. Huſſey, after ſtating that a great part of the popery laws, which he ſtiles *impolitic religious penalties*, are now removed, mentions that the reſt, that is, the teſts, are in ſuch a ſtate of progreſs to be totally removed, that if any body of people ſhall preſume to throw obſtacles in the way of ſuch removal, they will be cruſhed by their own raſh endeavours; heightening this threat and rendering it more terrible, by the ſimile of a monſtrous rock rolling down from a precipice upon them, and reducing them to atoms in a moment. The perſons he ſuppoſes may deſign to throw obſtacles in the way, he calls a *junto*, meaning the Proteſtants of Ireland in general, the probable agents in creating obſtacles he calls *mobs*. Sir, the aſſurance of this man is very nearly equal to your own. Surely the undaunted ſpirit of political lying never manifeſted itſelf more openly, than in this prieſt, on this occaſion. Mobs, ſir, all perſons, your friends and enemies know and admit are the tools with which you and your aſſociates work. The bulk of mobs, though they may be guided by perſons of ſuperior rank, are always the indigent and uninformed claſſes of ſociety, and Mr. Huſſey admits, that ſuch claſſes are chiefly, if not entirely, compoſed of Romaniſts. But the collections of people whom Mr. Huſſey means to repreſent as mobs, are the great corporations, and the grand juries of the ſeveral counties, of the kingdom, all of whom have at different times expreſſed their decided opinions againſt, and deprecated, the repeal of the parts of the Popery laws which were abrogated in 1793, and againſt all further relaxations of them; and upon what ſound reaſons they grounded their opinions may be now ſeen by the conduct of you and your aſſociates. Mr. Huſſey concludes with an argument for the ſeparation of this country from the Britiſh Empire, and grounds it with ſufficient artifice, as if it was an obſervation *en paſſant*, on the geographical poſition of Ireland, that it is a nation whoſe *inſulated* ſituation ſepa-

rates

rates it from all the reſt of the world: and that the perſevering diſpoſition of its natives is, as diſtinct from that of the inhabitants of the reſt of the world, as its geographical ſituation is from the reſt of the earth.

Thus has this Iriſh Romiſh prieſt, under the maſk and title of a paſtoral letter, publiſhed a libel, in which he endeavours with all his power to draw a line of everlaſting ſeparation between Iriſh Proteſtants and Romaniſts, and to perpetuate hoſtility, to exaſperate the Romaniſt againſt the Proteſtant by the moſt rancorous falſehoods, recounting antiquated hardſhips, and exaggerating them with the moſt malignant miſrepreſentation; as he does alſo the relative numbers of the Iriſh Romaniſts, to encourage inſurrection by miſcalculated ſtrength: inventing oppreſſions of the Romiſh military in religious matters never exerciſed or thought of, except by himſelf; that under pretence of complaint on that head, he might introduce the doctrine of mutiny againſt their officers, telling them that they are not bound to obey their officers in ſpiritual matters, and reſerving to himſelf, and others of his own kidney, the determination of what ſhall be deemed ſpiritual matters, that is, the determination of, what commands of their officers ſhall be obeyed by the Romiſh ſoldiers, and ſlyly and wickedly ſuggeſting to the ſoldiers, that the proper opportunity of revenge on their officers, is the time of action, telling them they may then revenge themſelves of their *perſecutors*, ſo he ſtiles the officers, by ſlaughtering them and deſerting to the enemy: indeed, the main drift of the libel ſeems to be, to induce the Romiſh ſoldiers, on the invaſion of this country, well known to be deſigned by the enemy, to cut the throats of their officers and join the hoſtile battalions. He endeavours, inſidiouſly enough, to preach up your own doctrine, and that of your colleague, and of your *popular energetic Romaniſts*, that is, the doctrine of ſeparation from Britain, and the eſtabliſhment of a republic in Ireland, independent of Britain, and he threatens abſolute deſtruction to all Iriſh Proteſtants who ſhall preſume to impede the progreſs of his meaſures, exactly in the ſame ſtrain with your addreſs, your three

poſts

poſts of ſafety, and example of the diſmal fate of American loyalty! Since the Iriſh government deemed it neceſſary to eſtabliſh a ſeminary in Ireland for the education of Romiſh prieſts, to obviate the ill effects of foreign education, and principles of foreign politics, imbibed by gentlemen of that perſuaſion, deſtined for the miniſtry, and to plant the principles of loyalty to their king in their minds in the place of ſuch rank weeds of diſaffection, which were hitherto ſuffered to take root in them; ſurely no man on earth could be found more unfit for the government of ſuch a ſeminary than an Iriſh prieſt, bred in Spain, the chaplain and emiſſary of the Marquis Del Campo, whoſe malignant pen overflows with gall againſt the Proteſtant ſubjects of the Britiſh empire; how long ſuch a man will be permitted to remain preſident of the ſeminary, it reſts with our chief governors to determine.*

The paſtoral letter of Doctor Troy, titular archbiſhop of Dublin, with remarks upon it.

Another very eminent Romiſh eccleſiaſtic, of whom, it is no compliment to ſay, that he is a much more loyal ſubject, than the Salamanca prieſt juſt mentioned, publiſhed a paſtoral letter in the year 1793. This letter alſo deviates in a great

* Mr. Huſſey is now removed from the preſidency of this ſeminary. He was not removed until the 29th of January laſt, after this tract had been written, about a year after the publication of his paſtoral letter, and juſt three days before the truſtees appointed viſitors of this ſeminary by act of parliament, all Romaniſts, (except the Lord Chancellor, and the three chief judges) and many of them titular Romiſh biſhops, who in fact govern the ſeminary; (the judges ſeldom interfering;) preſented a petition to parliament deſiring a further pecuniary aid to their ſeminary, of ten thouſand pounds of the public money, which they obtained; together with an implied engagement from parliament to grant them an annual ſtipend of eight thouſand pounds. And Mr. Huſſey was then removed by them from the preſidency of this ſeminary, not for the publication of this infamous libel, but for non-reſidence.

The Iriſh Romaniſts were enabled by act of parliament to found this ſeminary for the excluſive education of Romiſh prieſts from the ſubſcriptions of their own people in 1795; and in the year 1798, when they preſented their laſt petition to parliament for aid, no Romaniſt either in England or Ireland, had ſubſcribed a penny towards the foundation. They have now obtained from parliament thirty-ſix thouſand pounds, and an engagement to give them annually hereafter eight thouſand pounds for their ſubſiſtence out of the public purſe, in the midſt of a moſt expenſive war.

a great meaſure from its title, and launches with ſome degree of temerity too far into the ocean of politics. The author of it, Doctor Troy, the titular archbiſhop of Dublin, is univerſally reputed a gentleman of great worth and integrity; I quote his work merely to ſhew, that even he, whom I believe to be as loyal a ſubject to his ſovereign, as any Romaniſt can be to a Proteſtant prince, and himſelf a ſteady royaliſt, takes ſome pains to prove, that Romaniſts have not, as Romaniſts, any particular attachment to monarchy: he thus writes, page 26, "The ancient republics of Florence, "Piſa and Sienna were eſtabliſhed and governed by Roman "Catholics, who ſtill continue to ſupport thoſe of Poland, "of Venice, of Genoa, of Raguſa, of Lucca, and of Ma-"rino. The Roman Catholics form the moſt conſiderable "part of the Helvetic union, and it is remarkable, that "they have adopted a democratical, whereas the Calviniſt "and Zuinglian cantons, have preferred an ariſtocratical "form of government." As you, ſir, allege in your addreſs, that the minds of the Romaniſts have been, by the American and French revolutions, greatly changed, and that a very marvellous alteration has taken place in their opinions; it will not be amiſs here to give you ſome further quotations from this paſtoral epiſtle of Doctor Troy, publiſhed in 1793, he being then and now titular archbiſhop of Dublin. In page 31, is the following paſſage: "It is a fundamental article of the Roman Catholic faith, that the "pope or biſhop of Rome, as ſucceſſor to St. Peter, prince "of the apoſtles, in that ſee, enjoys by divine right a ſpiritual and eccleſiaſtical primacy, not only of honour and "rank, *but of real juriſdiction and authority*, in the univerſal "church. Roman Catholics conceive this point as clearly "eſtabliſhed in the ſcriptures, and by the conſtant tradition "of the fathers in every age, as it is by the expreſs deciſions "of their general councils, which they conſider as infallible "authority in points of doctrine." The ſame author, page 97, "Catholics cannot conſcientiouſly abjure the eccleſi-"aſtical authority of the biſhop of Rome. He is guardian "of the general canons, and can alone diſpenſe with them,

"*proprio*

" *proprio jure*, or by inherent right. Others enjoy that " power by delegation from him. The erection, ſuppreſ- " ſion and union of biſhopricks, and other particular bene- " fices; the elevation of ſees to the metropolitical dignity " and juriſdiction; the inſtitution of general faſts and " holidays; diſpenſations from their obſervance; the regula- " tion and inſpection of our liturgy; *appeals from inferior ec-* " *cleſiaſtical courts to his ſupreme tribunal;* the ſuſpenſion and " reſtoration of biſhops; *and numberleſs other particulars of* " *our general church diſcipline* mentioned in the canons, de- " pend on the pope, as on our eccleſiaſtical ſuperior, and " are connected with his primacy of juriſdiction in the uni- " verſal church. Henry the eighth of England, was the " firſt chriſtian prince, that aſſumed eccleſiaſtical ſupremacy, " and commanded an enſlaved parliament to enact it as a " law of the ſtate. *The Catholics conſider it an uſurpation.*"
A declaration of the principles of Romaniſts having been publiſhed in 1792, drawn up by the ſtanding committee, *your popular and energetic Romaniſts*, whom you repreſent as now free from all influence of pope and prieſt, Doctor Troy thus writes reſpecting that declaration and the Iriſh laity of his communion, page 102: " The declaration was *reſpect-* " *fully* ſubmitted to the conſideration of the Catholic clergy " by the Catholic committee, nor was it publiſhed, till after " the clergy of Dublin had generally approved and ſigned " it, as containing nothing contrary to the articles of Catho- " lic faith; it was afterwards ſubſcribed by biſhops and " clergy in every part of the kingdom in ſimilar terms."

" The Catholic laity of Ireland reſpect their clergy, and " conſider it a duty to be regulated by their determinations " in all points of religious doctrine. They are attached to " their paſtors and ſpiritual guides, who love them as their " children in Chriſt. Clergy and laity are united by the " moſt tender and intereſting conſiderations. Every effort " to diſſolve the union muſt prove ineffectual. Intereſt and " duty continue to render it indiſſoluble. In adverſity and " proſperity, they muſt riſe or fall together." I muſt here, ſir, remind you, that you and your party in the Houſe of

Commons in 1793 produced this very declaration mentioned in Doctor Troy's letter, and read it in the Houſe, as a juſtification of the tenets of the Romaniſts, and as an argument of their being loyal ſubjects, and fit to be truſted with the franchiſes to be conferred on them by the bill in their favour then before the Houſe. And yet when that very declaration was reduced into the form of an oath; and it was propoſed on the debate of the bill, that all Romaniſts who ſhould take the benefit of that bill, in caſe it ſhould paſs into a law, ſhould take that oath; you, and all the Romiſh party in the Houſe made uſe of every argument you could think of, and every artifice it was in the power of the moſt ingenious chicane to ſuggeſt, to defeat the propoſal: in which you would have been ſucceſsful, had not ſome very leading intereſts in the Houſe, who had been cajoled by the miniſter of that day, to concur in this bill, taken the alarm at this infamous duplicity of a party, founding their pretenſions on a declaration of their principles drawn up by themſelves, and afterwards declining to verify their ſincerity in theſe principles by an oath; and told the miniſter roundly, that they would vote againſt, and damn, the bill, unleſs the oath was inſerted: the miniſter, with whom on that occaſion you and your party were acting in concert, informed you of this circumſtance, and you were obliged moſt reluctantly to conſent to the inſertion of the oath in the bill, modified however, and much reduced below the ſtrength of the declaration. It has given me pain, in reading Doctor Troy's letter, to obſerve to what lamentable and ſophiſtical caſuiſtry, a man, as he is, of learning and good underſtanding, and, (detached from extreme bigotry to his ſect) of great integrity, is reduced, to reconcile that part of the declaration, ſtating *that it was no part of the faith of a Romaniſt, that the Pope was infallible*, to the avowed doctrine of the Romiſh church in that point. In ſhort, let any honeſt Proteſtant of tolerable underſtanding and learning read this paſtoral letter of Doctor Troy attentively through, and let him take it for granted, as I do, that he has therein fairly ſet forth and explained the doctrines of the Romiſh church, and it will

will be impoſſible for him not to conclude and determine, that the votaries of a ſect, holding ſuch doctrines, are thereby completely diſqualified from being either legiſlators or diſpenſers of the law, in a Proteſtant ſtate: and that it would be inſanity to admit them to either of theſe functions. Your firſt argument then in favour of what you are pleaſed to ſtile emancipation, to wit, that Romaniſts are not now what they were formerly, for that they have freed themſelves lately from all influence of pope, prieſt, or pretender, and that therefore they ſhould be admitted into parliament, and rendered capable of filling the great offices of the ſtate, is founded entirely on your own ipſe dixi—your own dogmatic aſſertion, your conſtant and only argument—not only without proof, but in contradiction to the inceſſant publications of your committee of nine, your *popular and energetic Romaniſts*, and of every diſtinguiſhed member of the Romiſh communion who have thought proper to publiſh their opinions on this ſubject. The influence of the pretender I have ſhewn already to be out of the queſtion; your *popular and energetic Romaniſts* are now under the influence of a more dangerous principle than attachment to the pretender, and more inimical to our conſtitution; inaſmuch as the influence of the pretender over them induced them to endeavour to transfer the imperial diadem of Britain, to which the kingdom of Ireland is annexed, and on which it is dependant, from the brows of one prince, to encircle the head of another. But the influence of republicaniſm over them, teaches them to overthrow the conſtitution by ſubſtituting in the place of the monarchy, a democratic republic; and to deſtroy the unity of the Britiſh Empire by tearing Ireland from it. The influence of pope and prieſt over the Iriſh Romaniſts, which is one and the ſame influence, remains as it always did and always will remain, as long as they ſhall continue to be Romaniſts, becauſe it is of the very eſſence of their religion, and cannot expire but with their religion: and it is the very principle of their religion, which in a Proteſtant ſtate excludes them from the functions of legiſlation or execution of the laws.

Beſides

Beſides the arguments already adduced to prove that this influence exiſts unimpaired with the Romaniſts, there is one argument, which, excluſive of all others, proves it to demonſtration, and that is, the rejection of the oath of ſupremacy by the Romaniſts, they will not abjure the power of the pope. The oath of ſupremacy is, *that no foreign prince, prelate, ſtate, or potentate, hath, or ought to have, any juriſdiction, power, ſuperiority, pre-eminence, or authority eccleſiaſtical or ſpiritual within this realm.* I ſhall, ſir, before I finiſh, more fully explain the reaſons of the incapacity of Romaniſts to exerciſe certain civil functions from this influence of the pope over them; at preſent I have ſtated enough to overturn your firſt argument in favour of Romiſh exaltation ariſing from the extinction of all influence of pope, prieſt, and pretender, over them, ſo roundly and ſo groundleſsly aſſerted by you. But as in this part of my anſwer I have mentioned and quoted Doctor Troy's paſtoral letter, I cannot avoid obſerving, that this letter contains ſome of the leaven, of which there is ſuch an exuberance in the ſeditious libel already mentioned of Mr. Huſſey. The following paſſage is to be found in page 99 of Doctor Troy's letter: "At "this day, Proteſtantiſm is the eſtabliſhed *ſtate* religion in "Ireland; the Catholic religion is that of the *Iriſh people*:" In the ſame ſpirit, Mr. Huſſey aſſerts, "that popery is the "*religion of Iriſhmen*:" Both very ſtrongly inſinuating, that the Proteſtants of Ireland are ſo inſignificant a body of men (though in number one third at leaſt, and in property and power twenty parts out of twenty-one, of the whole people) that when the word *people* is made uſe of, they are not entitled to any notice or conſideration; this ſerves to animate the Romiſh party, by magnifying their ſtrength, and depreciating that of the Iriſh Proteſtants. Menace alſo is not entirely omitted in Doctor Troy's letter, though introduced with more addreſs and caution, than are uſed by Mr. Huſſey. The quotation from Tertullian, addreſſing the Roman emperors and other pagans on behalf of the chriſtians in page 12 of Doctor Troy's letter, deſerves notice, in which the account of the numbers of chriſtians, and their ability to do miſchief to the

Roman

Roman empire, nay, to overturn it, at that time, if they were ſo inclined, is evidently applied by the Doctor to the preſent ſtate of Ireland: His majeſty and his Proteſtant Iriſh ſubjects, being alluded to by the pagans, and the Iriſh Romaniſts by the chriſtians. The ſame alluſion is continued in ſubſequent quotations reſpecting the perſecutions of chriſtians by Pagan and Arian emperors and kings; and as I have a perſonal reſpect for Doctor Troy, which I aſſure you, ſir, I do not entertain for you, for Mr. Huſſey, or your aſſociates, I do earneſtly recommend it to Doctor Troy hereafter to employ his pen, in ſetting before the people of his perſuaſion, that they now enjoy, equally with their Proteſtant countrymen, every advantage of a free conſtitution, the envy and admiration of every nation on earth, where the nature of that conſtitution is underſtood; in preference to rouſing into action thoſe furies, deſtructive of the human race, revenge, envy, avarice, and ambition, by the publication of threats and ill-conſidered and erroneous calculations of the relative numbers, ſtrength, and power of the Iriſh Romaniſts: which if fairly compared with the real ſtrength of the Iriſh Proteſtants, ariſing from the combined energy of their numbers, property, and ſituation, will afford no rational encouragement even to *popular and energetic Romaniſts*, to commence hoſtilities againſt their Proteſtant countrymen, if they had (as they have not) provocations ſufficient to juſtify ſuch dangerous extremities: and if compared with the relative numbers, ſtrength, and power of the Proteſtants of the Britiſh Empire, of which Ireland is only a part, and which Proteſtants, in caſe of an Iriſh rebellion, would to a man unite againſt the Iriſh Romaniſts: the almoſt infinite diſparity of force muſt enſure the defeat of ſuch ruinous projects, as well as the utter deſtruction of the projectors; as it has already done on four ſucceſſive trials; and it would be wiſe in Doctor Troy, and other reaſonable men of his profeſſion, maturely to conſider, whether reiterated menaces of Iriſh Romaniſts againſt their Proteſtant countrymen, and extravagant boaſts of their power and numbers, will not at length impel the Iriſh Proteſtants, on the principle of ſelf-defence,

to re-enact the popery code, or at leaſt ſome parts of it, which whilſt it continued to be part of the law of the land, kept the Romaniſts quiet, and enſured their ſubmiſſion to their ſovereign and the laws.

You ſtate, ſir, with the moſt dogmatic impudence, that the unconſtitutional influence of the crown, and the *proſcription* of the Catholics were the fundamental cauſes of our preſent diſcontents and jealouſies. As to the firſt cauſe, the influence of the crown, it is leſs now in this kingdom, than it was before the preſent diſcontents aroſe; and before I cloſe this anſwer, I ſhall demonſtrate that the crown neither has, nor exerciſes, any unconſtitutional influence in this kingdom; as to the ſecond pretended cauſe, I have already ſtated, that it is one of the moſt barefaced and malignant falſehoods, and ſlanders upon the Iriſh government, that ever was invented or propagated, that when you ventured to aſſert it in parliament, you were called upon to ſubſtantiate the accuſation by ſome proof, you never produced any, becauſe you could not, and you now repeat the calumny again, contented to ſuſtain the character of the convicted, irreclaimable, and unrepentant political falſifier, provided you can extract from the ſlander even the ſmalleſt ſpark of inflammation. The two cauſes therefore aſſigned by you for the preſent diſcontents could not be the cauſes, becauſe they never exiſted. You then proceed to urge the claim of the Romaniſts, to what you call emancipation, by alleging, "that the Iriſh Romaniſts of the preſent day have laid aſide all their ancient prejudices, that their minds have been in a ſtate of progreſſive improvement during the laſt 25 years, whilſt the mind of the ſtate, that is the underſtandings of all perſons concerned in the adminiſtration of the government, ſtood ſtill, and received no improvement; that the ſtate was the bigot, and the people the philoſopher. That all perſons who oppoſed the claims of the Romaniſts in parliament were declamatory dreamers, and infinitely inferior in underſtanding to the Romiſh orators who figured away at Francis-ſtreet chapel, as may be ſeen by the ſpeeches of both publiſhed in the newſpapers. That the "Romiſh

Further arguments of Mr. Grattan for emancipation.

" Romiſh newſpaper publications of the preſent day, amongſt " which are many of your own lucubrations, are the moſt " exquiſite ſpecimens of erudition, argument, and elocution " that were ever produced: that the clergy and higher order " of the laity are now the ignorant claſſes of ſociety, and the " lower claſſes of the people the enlightened: that the *intel-* " *lectual viſion* of theſe lower claſſes of the people was be- " come comprehenſive to an aſtoniſhing degree: that when " government complained of the preſs, they complained of " the ſuperiority of the popular underſtanding. That when " once the powers of Intellect are poſſeſſed by the great body " of the nation, 'tis madneſs to hope to impoſe on that na- " tion, civil or religious oppreſſion, particularly *in thoſe whoſe* " *underſtandings have been ſtationary, though their powers and* " *riches have been progreſſive.* That the part, the moſt *popu-* " *lar and energetic*, of the great body of the Romaniſts, had " formed with the great body of reformers, a Catholic, " Preſbyterian, and Proteſtant league, for the freedom of " the Romiſh religion, and a free and full repreſentation of " the people, burying theological diſcord for ever in the " love of civil and political liberty: that the preſent Iriſh re- " ligion is unanimity againſt deſpotiſm." It is here to be remarked, that throughout your whole addreſs by the term *people*, you mean Romaniſts excluſively; and by the terms higher claſſes, Proteſtants excluſively, whoſe minds you repreſent to be ſtationary, their power and riches progreſſive. The above declamatory and diffuſive argument, in favour of what you ſtile Catholic emancipation, may be thus condenſed. The Iriſh Romaniſts of the preſent day are not of the ſame opinions with their anceſtors, they were monarchiſts; the preſent race, at leaſt the moſt *popular* and *energetic* part of them, are republicans; all ſuch perſons, uſurping the titles of Proteſtants or Preſbyterians, as are the diſciples of Paine, Price and Prieſtley, being alſo republicans and enemies to the connexion with England, have embodied themſelves into a faction for the purpoſe of overthrowing the conſtitution, and forming a republic ſeparated from Great Britain: and being themſelves unequal to the attempt, they have applied

to the *popular* and *energetic Romaniſts* for aid. The views of both parties being the ſame as to ſeparation and republicaniſm, they have entered into a league, the object of which is, the ſubverſion of the conſtitution in church and ſtate. Therefore the Iriſh Proteſtants, attached friends to the conſtitution, ought to arm the Romaniſts with additional political powers, to enable them to be more effective allies to the deiſtical republicans in the patriotic work of ſubverſion and ſeparation. Such, ſir, is the abſurd argument, you have the preſumption to adduce, in ſupport of your project of emancipation, when diſrobed of all the unſubſtantial frippery with which you have attempted at once to deck and diſguiſe it. I cannot however diſmiſs this doughty argument, without a few ſtrictures on your taſte and feelings ſo fully delineated in the progreſs of it. You pour forth your praiſes on the daily publications in the Romiſh newſpapers, as well of the unrivalled excellence of the ſtile of theſe compoſitions, as of the matter of them. Now, ſir, as to the ſtile of theſe daily publications, I have the general opinion of all men of letters with me, when I aſſert that ſuch effuſions of barbariſm and nonſenſe never before, at any period ſince the invention of printing, flowed from the preſs, as have flowed from the Romiſh preſſes in the city of Dublin, for theſe five or ſix years paſt, and I leave you, ſir, in full enjoyment of the delight you daily receive from the peruſal of ſuch Attic compoſitions; your own performances ſometimes fill their columns, you are yourſelf in compoſition a perfect *artifex deliciarum:* treaſure up, ſir, every one of thoſe valuable productions, they will be preſerved by nobody elſe, may you be the aſylum—the retreat of all thoſe ephemeral emanations from intellects congenial with your own!

> Where all the ſuffering brotherhood retire,
> And 'ſcape the martyrdom of jakes and fire.

I ſhall obſerve no further on your taſte, but conclude with the line of the Mantuan poet,

> Qui Bavium non odit, amet tua carmina, Mævi!

As

As to the matter of theſe publications, which you repreſent as *powerful, of profound and ſpirited inveſtigation*, I may ſafely appeal to the public, whether there ever was, in any age or country, ſo much profligacy and wickedneſs, ſo openly and ſo notoriouſly recommended to practice, and praiſed in ſuch extravagant terms, as in the daily publications, of theſe infamous newſpapers, which are the diſgrace of the age, and of the nation. They publicly excite to murder and robbery, and that they have been too ſucceſsful in propagating ſuch helliſh doctrines is a melancholy truth, that cannot be denied. The ſtate of the country atteſts it, and you, ſir, have openly in your preſent addreſs laviſhed your praiſes on the horrible murders and robberies nightly committed, as I have already obſerved: You ſtate, ſir, expreſsly, that all theſe diſorders are committed in a public cauſe, that is, for the benefit of the public, thus exclaiming to the citizens of Dublin: "It is a public cauſe, and "let no man perſuade you, that it is not the cauſe of liberty on "one ſide, and tyranny on the other;" in this manner aſſerting the juſtice and propriety of all theſe nocturnal murders and depredations. In another place you inſinuate that the execution of the law on ſome of thoſe malefactors, gave them a title to martyrdom, and that the cauſe of reform, in which according to you they had committed the murders for which they ſuffered, would be promoted by their martyrdom; as the chriſtian religion was propagated by the blood of its firſt martyrs: Thus encouraging aſſaſſination and murder by the groſſeſt impiety. It may be juſtly obſerved on theſe newſpaper publications, that their ſtupidity and vulgarity do not in the leaſt diminiſh the acrimony of the poiſon they contain, the vehicle is ſufficient to convey it to the underſtandings of the mob, well inclined to uſe it againſt their ſuperiors. It is obſerved in hiſtory, that the poiſon, a few drops of which diluted in wine deſtroyed Alexander the Great, was of ſo frigid a nature, that it burſted all veſſels into which it was put, except an excavated aſs's hoof; but ſuch its frigidity and the baſeneſs of its vehicle in no wiſe diminiſhed its deleterious qualities. One newſpaper weekly publiſhed in Dublin, points out by name the victims deſtined, as it aſſerts, to aſſaſſination by a committee of United Iriſhmen;

men; and ſtrongly urges the neceſſity of immediate execution. I preſume, ſir, this is one of your *powerful publications*; and as each ſucceſſive day exceeds the preceding, in examples of all kinds of murder, robbery, and wickedneſs, I am ſtrongly induced to agree with you in one point, viz. that the minds of your *popular* and *energetic* Romaniſts, as well as your own, are in a ſtate of progreſſion; for it is an old and true obſervation, that vice is progreſſive, *nemo repentè fuit turpiſſimus*.

I have now, ſir, gone through ſuch arguments (if they deſerve that name) as you have adduced directly in ſupport of the meaſure, ſo fraudulently ſtiled by you *emancipation*. But other arguments you have introduced in ſupport of the ſame meaſure, by way of anſwer to arguments which as you ſtate had been made uſe of by its adverſaries, and which you groſsly miſrepreſent, as uſual with you, mixing your miſrepreſentations with a due portion of direct notorious falſehood; and ſuggeſting that your adverſaries had uſed arguments, the abſurdity of which proves them to be the genuine offspring of your own brain, created by you for two purpoſes, the one, to fix the imputation of folly on your adverſaries; the other to ſhew your dexterity in refuting them; as children erect houſes of cards to have the pleaſure of overturning them by a blaſt of their mouths. For inſtance, you ſtate: "That "the only impediment to the Catholic claim" (meaning emancipation) "as the law ſtands, was the *oath* requiring "the abjuration of the worſhip of the Virgin Mary, and of "the doctrine of the real preſence. That it was argued by "the adverſaries of that claim, that it was irreconcileable "with the ſafety of the king, that to make theſe points, at "ſuch a time as the preſent, a matter of alarm to the ſafety "of the king, was to give an air of ridicule to the ſerious "calamities in which his miniſters had involved him." Then, ſir, you launch out into the moſt delightful declamation on the abſurdity of perſons inſiſting that others ſhould be of the ſame religious opinions with themſelves. This is an old topick with philoſophers and freethinkers, ſuch as Tom Chubb the ſoap-boiler, and Tom Paine the ſtay-maker; Toland, Tindall, Collins, Morgan, Aſgill, &c. &c. they have

have already exhauſted all their eloquence and wit upon it, and there is no ſect of chriſtianity, againſt which the ridicule, attached to ſuch a doctrine, applies ſo ſtrongly as the Roman Catholic, becauſe of all chriſtian ſects, that has moſt violently and moſt frequently exerciſed perſecution, and it is in fact the moſt intolerant. How did you hug yourſelf when the following beautiful figurative ſentences flowed from your pen! "That kings had no right to enter into the tabernacle of the "human mind, and hang up images of their own orthodoxy; "that the Catholics did not inſiſt his Majeſty ſhould be of "their religion, that his Majeſty had no right to exact that "the Catholics ſhould be of his—that we know of no royal "rule either for religion or mathematics: that in matters "of religion both king and ſubject are equally dark and "ſhould be equally humble; that when courts or kings "aſſume a dictation on that ſubject, they aſſume a familiarity "with the Almighty, which is exceſs of blaſphemy as well "as blindneſs!" then you proceed, ſir, *like* a great philoſopher as you are, to philoſophize on the nature of the divinity and his attributes, and the inefficacy and even folly of addreſſing the divinity in *prayer*, which you honour with the title of *luxurious and complimentary devotion:* in all which moſt philoſophic rant, though you diſplay the profundity of your ſpeculation on your own *immeaſurable inanity* (to uſe your own expreſſions) yet you are certainly ſomewhat inferior to your maſters, Tom Chubb, Tom Paine, and the reſt of the gang, all of whom, excluſive of their priority of declamation on the ſubject, in ſome parts of their writings outdo you, in flighty, frothy, and unintelligible bombaſt! It is worthy of notice however, that your deduction from the admitted abſurdity, of perſons inſiſting that others ſhould adopt their religious opinions, is ſomewhat too general, for you deduce generally, that difference of religious opinions ſhould not exclude any ſubjects from becoming legiſlators in the ſtate; from which it will follow, that in a chriſtian ſtate, the Mahometan, the Jew, and the Pagan, have an equal right with the chriſtian ſubjects, to become legiſlators; a doctrine which ſuch philoſophers as yourſelf, and particularly you

French

French maſters, had not only ſwallowed themſelves, but endeavoured to ram it down the throats of others, but which every ſect of real chriſtians will find ſomewhat hard of digeſtion.

Mr. Grattan groſsly miſrepreſents the impediment to the Catholic claim of emancipation.

But, ſir, after thus paying my homage to your philoſophy, to your eloquence, and your wit, it is time to return to your aſſertions. And pray, ſir, where have you found the *oath* requiring the abjuration of the worſhip of the Virgin Mary and the doctrine of the real preſence, which *oath* you aſſert to be the only impediment of the Catholic claim? I have very carefully examined the ſtatutes, and I cannot find that any ſuch oath is enjoined to be taken on any occaſion by any of his majeſty's ſubjects. All members of parliament before they are permitted to vote in either houſe, are obliged to repeat and ſubſcribe a declaration, in which is contained a diſavowal of the belief of the doctrine which enjoins the invocation and adoration of the Virgin Mary, and of other ſaints. They are alſo, at the ſame time, obliged to take the oath of allegiance to his majeſty, the oath of ſupremacy, and the oath of abjuration of the deſcendants of the late King James the ſecond; but no oath whatſoever abjuring the worſhip of the Virgin Mary and the doctrine of the real preſence. Proteſtants admit the bleſſed Virgin, as having been the earthly mother of our Redeemer, to be in dignity the greateſt of ſaints, but they do not think her to be a divinity, or part of the divinity, and therefore entitled to adoration. The declaration above mentioned was enjoined to be repeated and ſubſcribed by all members of parliament in England, in the latter end of the reign of King Charles the ſecond, when the nation was full of apprehenſions of the evils likely to enſue, from the acceſſion to the crown of the then heir apparent, who was a Roman Catholic, the juſtice of which apprehenſions was afterwards fully eſtabliſhed; and the legiſlature then framed this declaration, as a ſort of barrier againſt the inundation of popery, which they dreaded; it was afterwards adopted in this kingdom. It is a doctrine which can be well maintained by all the principles of juſtice, reaſon, and common advantage of all the ſubjects of a ſtate, in which there is an eſtabliſhed religion, that no perſon ſhould be admitted to be a legiſlator in ſuch a ſtate who is not a member of the eſtabliſhed

bliſhed religion : but our laws enjoin no oaths to be taken abjuring points of doctrine, which, reduced to practice, induce no detriment to the ſtate. Thus, ſir, your aſſertion, that the only impediment to the Catholic claim, as the law now ſtands, is the oath requiring the abjuration of the worſhip of the Virgin Mary, and of the doctrine of the real preſence, is falſe in fact, there being no ſuch oath by law required to be taken by Romaniſts or any other ſubjects ; and indeed in this particular, I believe the falſehood is not imputable to your heart, but to your ignorance of law and fact. And then, ſir, what becomes of your elegant declamation, in which you have laboured to rival and ſurpaſs, your maſters the ſoap-boiler and ſtay-maker, founded on this falſe aſſertion ! all your reprobation of royal rules in religion or mathematics ! of royal dictation in matters of religion ! of the blindneſs and exceſſive blaſphemy of kings in aſſuming a familiarity with the Almighty ! All this rant proceeds from your own blindneſs, ignorance, and vanity, ſeaſoned with a due proportion of your inveterate malignity againſt the monarchical government of your country.

The real impediment to the claim of emancipation.

And now, ſir, I will tell you a real and true impediment, as the law ſtands, ariſing from an oath, to the admiſſion of Romaniſts into either Houſe of Parliament, or into the great executive offices of the ſtate ; an impediment which has not law alone, but reaſon and the ſafety of the ſtate for its baſis, and which, ſir, many members of the laſt Parliament as well as myſelf, whom in your addreſs you diſtinguiſh by the title of dreamers, have frequently mentioned in the Houſe of Commons in debates on this claim of the Romaniſts, and ſupported by arguments founded on juſtice, reaſon, and law ; to which arguments you ſometimes oppoſed declamatory, inflated nonſenſe, loud hyſterical exclamations, uncommon grimace, and diſtortions of your body ; for in truth you were unable to refute the arguments, and ſo were men much abler than you, then voting with you in the Houſe : at other times, conſcious of your inability to anſwer you ſat wrapped up in your own aſſumed importance, like the maniac in Bedlam, who fancied himſelf pope, and affected to treat the arguments of your opponents with contempt, which they returned with conſiderable

ſiderable intereſt. *The true impediment is, that Romaniſts refuſe to take the oath of ſupremacy, part of which oath is,* "*That* "*no foreign Prince, Prelate, State, or Potentate hath, or ought* "*to have, any juriſdiction, power, ſuperiority, pre-eminence or* "*authority eccleſiaſtical or ſpiritual, within this Realm.*" By the Iriſh Statutes of the 28th of Henry the 8th, chap. 5th, and of the 2nd of Eliz. chap. 1ſt. the kings and queens of this realm, and their ſucceſſors, are declared to be ſupreme heads, that is, governors of the church of Ireland, and by theſe two acts, as well as by another, of the 28th of Henry the 8th, chap. 13, the authority and juriſdiction both temporal and ſpiritual, before that time claimed and exerciſed by the pope in Ireland are utterly aboliſhed; and by the laſt ſtatute it is enacted, that if any perſon ſhall, by writing or act, maintain the authority of the Biſhops of Rome heretofore uſed in this kingdom, he ſhall incur the penalty of premunire.

It is very notorious that all Iriſh Romaniſts acknowledge the authority, pre-eminence, and juriſdiction of the biſhop of Rome in *ſpirituals* within this kingdom; if any change has taken place in the underſtandings and opinions of the Iriſh Romaniſts, as you, ſir, aſſert, it is not a change of their opinions of the juriſdiction of the pope in *ſpirituals* in this kingdom: the oath of allegiance preſcribed to be taken by Iriſh Romaniſts, contains a clauſe, that the pope has no *temporal or civil juriſdiction* directly or indirectly within this realm; one fortieth part of the Iriſh Romaniſts have not yet taken this oath; but they all to a man refuſe to take the oath of ſupremacy, diſclaiming the *ſpiritual* juriſdiction of the pope: and Doctor Troy before mentioned, the Romiſh archbiſhop of Dublin, in open defiance of the ſtatute of the 28th of Henry the 8th before mentioned, has, in his paſtoral letter publiſhed in 1793, maintained the ſpiritual juriſdiction of the pope in Ireland: he has alſo ſtated, that the declaration of the principles of Romaniſts before mentioned was reſpectfully ſubmitted to the inſpection of himſelf and the Romiſh clergy in Ireland, by the ſtanding committee of the Romaniſts, and was approved of by them before it was publiſhed.

Doctor

Doctor Troy thus ſtates: "That Catholics are obliged to "believe, *as an article of their faith*, that the pope or biſhop of "Rome, as ſucceſſor of ſaint Peter, is the ſupreme viſible "head of the church on earth, and the centre of Catholic "unity; with a primacy by divine right of *real authority and* "*juriſdiction* in the univerſal church, and that all Catholics "owe him canonical reſpect and obedience on that account; "and he repreſents this ſupremacy of the pope as one of thoſe "points on which all Catholics are agreed, as an *immutable* "*article of their faith.*" See Doctor Troy's paſtoral letter, page 72. It appears clearly that Doctor Troy has fairly repreſented the opinions of the Iriſh Romaniſts of this day of the *ſpiritual* ſupremacy of the pope, and that they have not in the leaſt changed their opinions in that reſpect; becauſe they reject univerſally at this day the oath of ſupremacy, abjuring the ſpiritual authority of the pope in this kingdom. That it is impoſſible to diveſt the ſupremacy in ſpirituals, of a very conſiderable ſhare of temporal power, is very eaſy to be proved: the abſolute ſeparation of the two powers is impracticable. I ſhall juſt mention one inſtance of the indiſſoluble connexion in a chriſtian country, of ſpiritual and temporal power. On the lawfulneſs of matrimony depends almoſt entirely, the ſucceſſion to all temporal property, whether real or perſonal: matrimony by the Romaniſts is held a ſacrament, the validity of it is entirely of ſpiritual juriſdiction: if the pope then, as Romaniſts hold, has the ſupreme and final juriſdiction in this particular, he muſt derive very great temporal power and influence from it; he muſt ultimately decide, whether a perſon claiming under his father or his mother, is entitled to the ſucceſſion to their real or perſonal property, becauſe ſuch deciſion will depend on the validity of their marriage; he muſt decide whether a party has, or has not, a right to intermarry with another, or whether a party is barred from that right by conſanguinity, affinity, pre-contract, or former marriage; he muſt ultimately decide on ſeparate maintenance, alimony, or whether a man is, or is not, bound to pay the debts of a woman, claiming him as her huſband, with a hundred other temporal incidents. It will, ſir, be worth your attention to conſider

A great ſhare of temporal power adheres to, and is inſeparably connected with, the ſupremacy in ſpirituals.

conſider what opinion the parliament of this kingdom, juſt eſcaping from the fangs of the pope's uſurped authority, entertained of the *temporal* effects of the *ſpiritual* juriſdiction of the Pope exerciſed in the caſe of matrimony alone: In an Iriſh ſtatute enacted in the 33d year of Hen. 8th, entitled "An act for marriages," are the following paſſages: "Whereas heretofore the uſurped power of the Biſhop of "Rome hath always entangled and troubled, the *juriſdiction* "*and regal power* of this land of Ireland, and alſo inquieted "much the ſubjects of the ſame, by his uſurped power in "them, as by making that unlawful which by God's word "is lawful, both in marriages *and other things*, whereof ſome "ſparkles be left which hereafter might kindle a great fire." The ſtatute then proceeds, "that it was cuſtomary for the "Court of Rome, to divorce parties who had been long "married and had iſſue, on the pretence of pre-contracts "without conſummation, and of kindred between couſins "german, and ſo to fourth and fifth degrees, and of carnal "knowledge of any of the ſame kin or affinity before, in ſuch "outward degrees, to procure money for diſpenſations, "*whereby not only much diſcord between lawful married perſons* "*hath ariſen, much debate and ſuit at law, with wrongful* "*vexation, and great damage of the innocent parties hath been* "*procured, and many juſt marriages in doubt and danger of* "*undoing, and alſo many times undone, and lawful heirs diſ-* "*inherited, and marriages have been brought to ſuch an un-* "*certainty thereby, that no marriage could be ſo ſure knit and* "*bounden, but it ſhould be in either of the parties power to* "*defeat the ſame.*"

Innumerable other inſtances, of the inſeparable adheſion of temporal power to ſupreme ſpiritual power, can be adduced, and Iriſh Romaniſts not only hold, that the ſupreme legiſlature of the ſtate, whether that ſtate be monarchical or republican, is utterly incompetent to bind them, even to a paſſive, much leſs to an active, obedience in ſpiritual affairs; but unequivocally hold, that the ſole power of enacting, interpreting or executing laws, reſpecting ſpiritual matters, is veſted in the pope, a foreign prince, and this tenet they eſteem an article of their faith,

faith; and as they will not allow that any law of the ſtate is binding on them in ſpiritual matters, it follows of courſe, that they hold it as an article of their faith, that the law of the ſtate cannot bind them in ſuch temporal matters as are inſeparably united to ſpiritual matters, ſuch as matrimony, and all its conſequences; and innumerable others: Romaniſts then, if admitted to the functions of legiſlation in the ſtate, muſt, if they act conſcientiouſly, endeavour with all their power to abrogate and aboliſh all temporal laws now in force, or which may be at any time propoſed to be enacted, which relate to ſpiritual affairs, whether connected with temporal matters or not, but more eſpecially when ſo connected: and if they ſhall be intruſted with the great executive offices of the ſtate, they muſt conceive themſelves in conſcience bound to obſtruct the execution, and defeat the effect of them, to the beſt of their power; hence muſt follow a great alteration, if not a total ſubverſion, of our conſtitution. Is it conſiſtent with the rules of either reaſon or civil policy to make legiſlators of thoſe, who make it an article of their faith, that the ſupreme legiſlature of the ſtate (whether monarchical or republican it ſignifies not) is not competent to bind them by its laws in all caſes? and that they are in conſcience bound to ſo active a diſobedience to the laws of their country enacted by the legiſlature of it, in many inſtances, not only of a ſpiritual, but a temporal nature, as to endeavour with all their might to obſtruct, and defeat, the execution of them? and are ſuch perſons to be truſted with the execution of thoſe laws? no perſon of common ſenſe will anſwer theſe queſtions in the affirmative.

It has been ſometimes objected to this mode of reaſoning, that no inconvenience is experienced in Roman Catholic ſtates, the ſubjects of which hold the independence of the ſpiritual on the temporal power; to this I anſwer, that in ſuch ſtates the general tenor of the laws is conformable to the doctrines of the Romiſh church, and that almoſt all thoſe ſtates, whether monarchies or republics, exerciſe a very deſpotic power over their ſubjects, and therefore find their account in preſerving a ſtrict alliance with the clergy, to enable

them more effectually to maintain that deſpotic authority which they aſſume, and to wink at religious uſurpations to countenance their own invaſions of the rights of the people; beſides, *popular opinions are of little weight in ſuch governments, from all ſhares in which the people are generally excluded:* but in a Proteſtant ſtate there can be no alliance between the ſtate and the Romiſh clergy; their creeds reſpecting the powers of legiſlation, are not only different, but hoſtile; and in a Proteſtant ſtate, ſuch as the Britiſh empire, in which part, and the moſt efficient and powerful part, of the legiſlature, is an elective popular aſſembly, and civil liberty its aim, it would be utterly inconſiſtent with its ſafety, or indeed exiſtence, to permit that aſſembly to be elected out of a part of the people, who hold as a point of faith, ſo anarchical a doctrine, that the ſtate is not ſupreme within the countries ſubject to its dominions; what infinite miſchief ſuch doctrine has produced even in Romiſh countries, and particularly in our own heretofore, and to what diſtreſs it has reduced ſome of the greateſt of our monarchs, the hiſtories of the different ſtates of Europe, and of our own in particular, ſufficiently teſtify.

I have heard ſome objections againſt the probability of any political evil reſulting from ſuch doctrine in caſe the aforeſaid impediment to the admiſſion of Romaniſts into the legiſlature were removed; they have indeed been chiefly urged by you, ſir, in your harangues in the Houſe of Commons, and they are ſo very weak and abſurd, that I would not have here taken notice of them, but with a view of expoſing to the world the miſerable weapons, the daggers of lath, with which ſuch a political harlequin as you are, have attempted to aſſault the conſtitution.

Mr. Grattan's argument drawn from the inbecility of the pope as a temporal prince examined and refuted.

Firſt, ſir, you have frequently dwelt on the impotence of the pope conſidered as a temporal prince, and ridiculed the apprehenſions entertained of his power to undermine, or in any ſhape to affect the government of this country; and aſſerted that the doctrine held by Romaniſts, that the pope was ſupreme head of the church on earth, and that the ſtate has no power to bind the laity in ſpiritual matters, but that

ſuch

ſuch power is veſted in the pope independent of the ſtate, is merely a ſpeculative doctrine inoperative from the inefficiency of the pope's temporal power. Contemptible ſophiſtry! The danger of the doctrine does not ariſe from the power or want of power of the pope, conſidered as a temporal ſovereign; it conſiſts entirely in the number and ſtrength of the ſubjects of the ſtate, *whoſe government is partly popular*, who hold ſuch a doctrine, as a point of faith: the perſon who denies that the ſupreme authority of the ſtate, of which he is a ſubject, is competent to bind him by its laws in ſpiritual matters, inſeparably connected with temporal in various inſtances, is a bad ſubject; and a great number of ſuch perſons in a ſtate form a faction very dangerous to it; they are the attached partizans and agents in a ſtate, of the foreign power whom they believe to be competent to bind them by its decrees in ſpiritual matters; and the danger of the ſtate ariſes from their ability and readineſs to execute ſuch decrees; the ſtate may be in the utmoſt danger from ſuch principles and ability in their own ſubjects, though the foreign oracle, whoſe mandates they obey, be not in his own ſtate or ſphere inveſted with any temporal power whatever: And it matters not to the ſtate whether ſuch ſupreme power be exerciſed or directed by the pope or by the Iriſh Romiſh clergy themſelves, ſo long as they maintain the dogma, that they are in ſpiritual matters independent of, and paramount to, the ſtate; or whether the pope be a weak or a powerful temporal prince: the danger to the ſtate ariſes from the number and ſtrength of its own ſubjects denying the ſtate to be competent to bind them to obedience to its laws, and to have the power within itſelf, to decide all cauſes between its own ſubjects, without appeal or application to any foreign tribunal, but on the contrary acknowledging the power of a tribunal independent of the ſtate in ſpiritual matters. If the influence of pope and prieſt over the Iriſh Romaniſts, as you maintain, is at an end, let them come forward and take the oath of ſupremacy; if they ſhall offer to take that oath, then, ſir, you may argue that mere ſpeculative points of doctrine held by Romaniſts, though contrary to the faith of Proteſtants, ſuch as the ado-

ration of the bleſſed virgin, the invocation of ſaints, and belief of the real preſence in the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper, and that moſt uncharitable dogma, that the ſouls of all perſons who are not of their communion are deſtined to eternal torments, ought not to exclude them from the legiſlative and executive capacities; and your arguments will have then ſome weight, though in all well regulated ſtates, perſons publicly maintaining mere ſpeculative points of doctrine contrary to that of the eſtabliſhed religion, have been generally excluded from any participation of legiſlative and other political capacities; becauſe difference in religious opinions, even in mere ſpeculative points, has been generally found to engender differences in political purſuits, and violent animoſities, feuds, and factions in a ſtate, where the leaders of the different ſects are poſſeſſed of a conſiderable ſhare of political power.

Mr. Grattan's argument drawn from the ſtate of the province of Canada, examined and refuted.

Your next argument againſt the probability of danger to the ſtate, from the admiſſion of the Iriſh Romaniſts into the legiſlative and executive capacities, is, that the province of Canada, part of the Britiſh Empire, remained faithful to Britain during the American war, though its inhabitants are Romaniſts; it is not ſtrange that you ſhould ſtuff this doughty argument, ſcouted and derided, as often as you have advanced it, into the farrago of your addreſs; you were determined to make it a general collection of all the rags and ſhreds, you had employed your whole life, in ſcraping from every dunghill of ſedition and treaſon in which you had rooted, with all the induſtry of the collector of rags for a paper mill. The province of Canada ſurrendered to the Britiſh arms by capitulation, part of which was, that the inhabitants ſhould enjoy their laws and religion, in the ſame manner they had done before they ſubmitted; Britain accepted of them as ſubjects on theſe expreſs conditions; they ſtipulated for the enjoyment of their religion, which was the Romiſh, and Britiſh faith, always inviolable, ſecured to them the full enjoyment of that religion. They were, before their ſurrender, governed by a French Viceroy, they are now governed by an Engliſh one, exerciſing, according to the capitulation,

capitulation, the ſame powers the French Viceroy did. The executive government of the country, and the military force, are in the hands of perſons appointed by his majeſty, and *the people in general have no ſhare in the government:* in ſuch a ſituation of things, in a remote province, ſubject to a great and powerful nation, the belief of the people in the ſpiritual ſupremacy of the pope, can do very little miſchief; 'tis little more there than a mere ſpeculative point of doctrine: But the caſe is widely different, in a nation, *the moſt efficient part of whoſe government, to wit, the Houſe of Commons, is elective by the people, as is the caſe in Ireland,* and the abſurdity of deducing the political innocence of ſuch a doctrine in Ireland, from its being found innoxious in the weak, remote, and newly conquered, province of Canada during the American war, *the maſs of whoſe inhabitants has no ſhare in the government,* is glaring and notorious. But the loyalty of the Canadians to the Britiſh Empire during that period is clearly deduced from neceſſity ariſing from their ſituation, and from the principle of ſelf-intereſt, independent of all religious conſiderations. There is only one entrance to the province of Canada from the ocean, to wit, the river St. Laurence: the winter is ſo rigorous in that climate, that this entrance is locked up by ice for ſix months in the year; the fortreſs of Quebec, and the oppoſite ſmall iſland of Orleans, ſhut up this entrance for the remaining ſix months, to be opened only to the ſubjects of that power, whether Proteſtant or Romaniſt, which poſſeſſes theſe barriers; and that power muſt for ages command the obedience of the Canadians, be they of what religious perſuaſion they may: they cannot at preſent exiſt for two ſeaſons, and hardly for one, without a ſupply of European commodities, they can be ſupplied with them only by the river St. Laurence: for between them and the united ſtates of America lies an immenſe tract of country, moſtly covered with foreſts, and thinly inhabited by barbarous and ferocious tribes of Indians: The river St. Laurence can be locked up by one thouſand troops and a frigate or two ſtationed at Quebec; thus it is apparent that the fidelity of the Romiſh Canadians to the Britiſh Empire during the

American

American war, was founded on neceſſity ariſing from ſituation, and from their intereſt; that no conſideration of religion was amongſt the cauſes of that war, and if it had been ſo, and if the war on the part of the Americans had been undertaken, for the purpoſe of ſubverting a Proteſtant eſtabliſhment and ſubſtituting a Romiſh in its place, yet ſuch was the ſituation and neceſſities of the Canadians, that they muſt have remained faithful to Britain during the conteſt. The ſituation of the Iriſh Romaniſts is in every reſpect different, and the deduction of their loyalty, if inveſted with legiſlative and executive authority in the ſtate, from the loyalty or rather obedience of the Romiſh Canadians to the Britiſh Empire during the American war, ariſing from ſituation and neceſſity, is equally ridiculous and abſurd. You rather hint, than urge, another kind of argument, tacked to the Canada argument, for what you call the emancipation of the Roman Catholics, and that is, that his majeſty's allies, (meaning the emperor and queen of Portugal) are Roman Catholics; how you can deduce that a part of his majeſty's Iriſh ſubjects being Roman Catholics, and not amounting to more than one ſixth part of his European ſubjects, ſhould be inveſted with the legiſlative and executive capacities in his dominions, at the manifeſt hazard of their domeſtic tranquility, from his majeſty's alliance with foreign powers of the Roman Catholic perſuaſion againſt a ferocious foreign enemy, is more than I can diſcover or explain, and I reſign that taſk to your own amazing ſagacity as a French philoſopher and politician.

Mr. Grattan's aſſertion that Iriſh Romaniſts have a natural and indefeaſible right to a full participation of the legiſlative and executive capacities examined and refuted.

After exhibiting theſe egregious ſpecimens of your argumentative powers, you proceed to aſſert roundly, that the Iriſh Romaniſts have as good a right to ſeats in parliament, and to the enjoyment of the great offices of the ſtate, as the king has to the crown, and that ſuch is an indefeaſible right. Before I quote your inſolent, petulant, and malignant aſſertions on this head, I muſt again repeat, that the Iriſh Romaniſts are now inveſted with all the privileges enjoyed by Proteſtants, except that they cannot ſit or vote in parliament, nor enjoy a few great offices of the ſtate, without taking the ſame teſt, which Proteſtants are obliged to take, to qualify

them

them for ſitting in parliament, and enjoying ſuch places; that ſuch teſt operates as an excluſion of Romaniſts in thoſe particulars, but not of Proteſtants; and that Iriſh Romaniſts, notwithſtanding that excluſion, now enjoy a much greater meaſure of civil liberty, than the moſt favoured ſubjects of any other ſtate on the face of the earth enjoy at this day. The right of Iriſh Romaniſts to ſeats in parliament and to the enjoyment of the great offices of the ſtate (the only portion of civil privileges from which they are now excluded, and excluded in the manner before mentioned only) you aſſert in this manner: "The principles which placed "his majeſty's family on the throne were thoſe of liberty. "His Iriſh ſubjects, if not convicted of felony, are entitled "to the benefit of theſe principles, and the Catholics have "in juſtice and reaſon *at leaſt* as good a right to liberty as "his majeſty has to the crown; we implored miniſters againſt "ſuch an enemy as democracy, a giant with a hundred "hands, to ally and identify the king with all his people, "without diſtinction of religion, and not to detach him "from any part of them, to make a miſerable alliance "with *prieſtcraft*, which *was a falling cauſe and a ſuperannu-* "*ated folly*."

Now, ſir, it is admitted, that the principles which placed his majeſty's family on the throne were thoſe of civil liberty, and that all his ſubjects, Engliſh and Iriſh, are entitled to the benefit of ſuch principles, unleſs they forfeit ſuch benefit, by being convicted according to law, of crimes, the legal puniſhment of which is loſs of liberty, or unleſs they entertain principles ſubverſive of civil liberty; all members of civil ſocieties, are obliged to ſurrender a portion of their natural rights to the ſociety, to procure the ſecure enjoyment of the rights of that ſociety, and if any members of that ſociety hold principles ſubverſive of the inſtitution, the ſociety has an abſolute right to abridge ſuch members of ſuch parts of the rights and privileges of that ſociety, as would enable them to diſturb, or in the end to ſubvert it, if they were permitted to exerciſe them; and ſuch right has in many inſtances been exerciſed by the legiſlature of this kingdom;

the

the place bill is one, which excludes from the legiſlative capacity perſons who hold, or ſhall hold, certain places, under the government, on the ground, that the conduct of ſuch perſons, if admitted into the legiſlative aſſembly, might be biaſſed by ſelf intereſt, and that they might vote therein, as directed by miniſters, to retain the emolument of their places, contrary to the intereſt of their conſtituents, and to the principles of the conſtitution. How much ſtronger are the grounds for excluding from the legiſlative capacity ſubjects who hold doctrines as points of faith, not only contrary, but hoſtile, to the fundamental laws of the ſtate, and the very conſtitution itſelf! The Iriſh Romaniſts have a right to enjoy, and actually do enjoy, all the privileges of the ſubjects of a free ſtate, and are abridged of no privileges, except of ſuch as they cannot be permitted to exerciſe, conſiſtent with the ſafety of the ſtate, to wit, the legiſlative and executive functions; the latter in ſome inſtances only. To inſinuate as you do, that all perſons are ſlaves, who do not enjoy the legiſlative and executive capacities, is to inſinuate a doctrine as falſe in theory, as in practice; all the ſubjects of a ſtate are equally free, who are bound by the ſame laws framed by perſons elected by themſelves, and to which the framers are equally ſubject with the reſt of the community; in ſuch ſenſe the Iriſh Romaniſts are intitled to liberty, and are free; but if you mean to aſſert, that Iriſh Romaniſts are as well intitled to the legiſlative and executive capacities as the king to his crown, by aſſerting that they have the ſame title to liberty as the king to the ſovereignty, making civil liberty to conſiſt in the enjoyment of the legiſlative and executive capacities, and ſlavery in the deprivation of them, though ſuch deprivation be demanded by the ſafety of the ſtate; ſuch your dogma is falſe and ſophiſtical, and cannot be ſupported on any ground of reaſon or civil policy, nor have you offered any one reaſon to ſupport it. Your rant about *deſtroying all diſtinctions in religion, and the miſerable alliance of the king with prieſtcraft, a falling cauſe, a ſuperannuated folly*, you have ſtolen, as you have many others, from your maſters Tom Chubb and Tom Paine; this is the plain Engliſh of it,

let

let all religious diſtinctions be aboliſhed (that is all religion; for as long as any religion ſhall remain, and there ſhall be different ſects of Chriſtians, Jews, Mahometans, and Pagans in the world, there will be diſtinctions in religion.) *Let his majeſty ſlight and violate his coronation oath, I will abſolve him from it! I am the pope of Anti Chriſt! That oath* contains the following clauſe: "I will to the utmoſt of my power main-"tain the laws of God, the true profeſſion of the goſpel, "and the Proteſtant reformed religion eſtabliſhed by law," *That oath allies the king to the Proteſtant religion, the Proteſtant religion is prieſtcraft! it is a falling cauſe! it is ſuperannuated folly!* In ſuch impious rants, purloined from the workſhops of the ſoap-boiler and the ſtay-maker, you have the intrepid impudence to addreſs the Proteſtant electors of the city of Dublin, who have juſt ſcouted you from their repreſentation for your apoſtacy! And may ſuch deſperate renegadoes from the religion and conſtitution of their country, never again impoſe themſelves by hypocritical frothy effuſions of mock patriotiſm, on the too eaſy credulity, and on the bounty, of their honeſt chriſtian Proteſtant countrymen!

Mr. Grattan's argument drawn from the contribution of Romaniſts to the expences of the war, and their ſervice in the fleets and armies, examined and refuted.

Your next argument in favour of the Romiſh claim to the legiſlative and executive capacities is, "That the Iriſh Roma-"niſts had contributed greatly to the expences of the war, "and had bled profuſely therein." This argument requires examination. The public debt of the ſtate of Ireland amounts to ſomething more than ſeven millions ſterling; this debt has not been all contracted ſince the commencement of the war; when it was propoſed in the Iriſh Houſe of Commons to reduce the hearth-money tax, about ſeven years ſince, calculations were laid before the houſe, made from the books of the hearth-money collectors, tending to prove, that there were about two millions of inhabitants in this kingdom, who from their poverty could not pay this tax, amounting only to four-pence in the year each, without the greateſt hardſhip; of theſe two millions ſix parts out of ſeven were Romaniſts. I have already ſhewn that of the maſs of real and perſonal property of this kingdom nineteen out of twenty parts are in the hands of Proteſtants, and four fifths of the

Iriſh

Iriſh Romaniſts pay no tax whatſoever, being freed from the hearth-tax, ſo that all public taxes muſt be paid by the Proteſtants, and about one-fifth of the Romaniſts; and on fair calculation the public taxes, eſtimated by the numbers and abilities of the inhabitants to pay, will be found to be chiefly paid by the Iriſh Proteſtants. Ireland has maintained no fleet for the proſecution of the war, and her whole annual contributions to the expence of a war, in which the Empire is engaged not for conqueſt, but ſalvation, do not amount to one-tenth part of the annual expenditure; nine-parts out of ten at leaſt of the annual expence being defrayed by Great Britain; and of this tenth nineteen parts out of twenty are paid by Iriſh Proteſtants, and in return for the pittance which Romaniſts have contributed to the expences of the war, they have ſhared the benefit of an increaſed trade, growing out of the ruin of that of the enemy; the annual exports of linen in particular, the ſtaple manufacture of the nation, having been almoſt doubled during the war, the ſame manufacture in Holland and the Netherlands, being annihilated by that calamity. But ſuppoſing the Romiſh ſubjects of this nation, bore an equal portion of the public burthens impoſed for the ſupport of the war with their Proteſtant fellow ſubjects, are they not fully repaid by the protection and ſecurity afforded them by a government whoſe very baſis is civil liberty? Is not every ſubject bound to ſupport with his life and his property that government which ſecures to him the enjoyment of his life and property? And does the pitiful contribution to the public burthens which can be extracted from the poverty of the Iriſh Romaniſts, to be employed in defraying the expence neceſſarily diſburſed on his own protection, which he is obliged by law to pay, and is not a voluntary contribution, give him a title to the legiſlative capacity in a ſtate, the ſupremacy of whoſe laws for internal regulation he makes it a point of conſcience to diſclaim? Such political anomalies can be ſuggeſted only by a head, diſtracted by the aches of diſappointed avarice and ambition; and a heart labouring with the throes of ſedition, privy conſpiracy and rebellion!

The

The other ſupport of the claim of Iriſh Romaniſts to the legiſlative and executive capacities which you urge, to wit, *that they have bled profuſely in the war*, will be found, on examination, to be equally weak with that of contribution to the expences. Thank heaven! Britons have not bled profuſely in this war, they have experienced no defeats, they have uniformly, when engaged, triumphed over their enemies; ſome blood they have loſt, but let us ſee what proportion of that was drained from the veins of Iriſh Romaniſts, fighting under the banners of the Britiſh empire. The navy is manned, and the army compoſed of the ſubjects of the empire indiſcriminately, and in reſpect to the navy, as the relative number of Britiſh ſeamen in proportion to the inhabitants of Great Britain exceeds the relative number of Iriſh ſeamen in proportion to the inhabitants of Ireland, the ſhipping of Great Britain exceeding the ſhipping of Ireland in a much greater ratio than the number of the inhabitants of the former exceeds that of the latter, the number of Britiſh ſeamen employed in the navy, muſt exceed the number of Iriſh ſeamen employed in that ſervice, in nearly the ſame ratio: I have already proved from the proportion of the ſurface of Great Britain to that of Ireland (ſuppoſing the population of both kingdoms to be in exact proportion to their reſpective ſurfaces) that the number of inhabitants of Britain exceed the number of inhabitants of Ireland in the proportion of ſeven to two, and that nearly all the inhabitants of Britain and one third of the inhabitants of Ireland are Proteſtants, ſo that the groſs proportion of Proteſtant inhabitants in the Britiſh iſlands to the Romiſh inhabitants on that ſuppoſition, is nearly as ſix to one: from ſuch calculation, it plainly follows, that the proportion of Proteſtants ſerving in the navy, to Romaniſts in the ſame ſervice, is as eight, if not nine or ten to one; and in the army as ſix to one; it is notorious, that all the officers and ſoldiers enter into the army, as into a profeſſion, by which they hope to obtain an honourable livelihood, and that not one in ten thouſand becomes a ſoldier, from the mere principle of ſerving his country; they are paid for their

ſervice

ſervice by their country, which counts on their gratitude for being ſo paid and employed; the ſame may be ſaid of the ſeamen and marines: The ſoldier and the mariner are the obliged parties; and not the country, or the government that employs them: how then does it follow from a comparatively ſmall portion of the army and navy being compoſed of Iriſh Romaniſts, paid by the ſtate for their ſervices, that they, profeſſing principles as points of faith, ſubverſive of the ſupremacy and conſtitution of the ſtate, have a right to legiſlative and executive capacities in the ſtate? It is alſo to be obſerved, that all the officers of the navy and in the army ſerving in Great Britain are Proteſtants, and muſt be ſo, by the laws there in force; and that almoſt all the officers ſerving in the Iriſh army are alſo Proteſtants. Some Romiſh officers have lately obtained commiſſions in the Iriſh army; they were Iriſh gentlemen, who being, by the popery laws now repealed, diſqualified to ſerve in the armies of the Britiſh Empire, accepted of commiſſions in the armies of France, whilſt its government was monarchical: the French monarchy being overturned, they no longer thought themſelves bound to ſerve in the French armies; they had originally engaged to ſerve a monarch, and they diſdained to ſerve the gang of aſſaſſins who had uſurped the government of that country; they were ſoldiers of fortune, and had no ſubſiſtence, ſave what they could procure by their ſwords: yet with great ſpirit and honour they abandoned the armies of France, and attached themſelves to thoſe of the coaleſced powers, in which they ſerved with ſignal bravery, under every diſadvantage of penury and diſtreſs; their country viewed their conduct and ſituation with admiration and compaſſion; though they had long ſerved in the ranks of her natural enemy, their ſufferings and their merit awoke her parental affection for them, ſhe pardoned their paſt tranſgreſſions, took them to her boſom, and gave them employment in her armies, in which many of them have fallen, bravely fighting for their king and country, deſerving of better fate, and the remainder ſerve with diſtinguiſhed honour, fidelity, courage and ability; but the claim of Iriſh Romaniſts,

iſts, to the legiſlative and executive capacities, cannot be ſupported on the gratitude of the ſtate to theſe gentlemen for their ſervices; every body muſt ſee that the weight of the obligation lies on their ſide.

You ſtate, ſir, that to your meaſure, which you with ſo much fraud ſtile the emancipation of the Catholics, it was objected, "that it was irreconcileable with the ſafety of the "king." I do not recollect that any ſuch objection was made to it; but to this objection of your own making, you inſert the following anſwer as petulant as it is fraudulent, "That the capacities of three-fourths of the people ſhould "not be made a perſonal compliment to his majeſty:" Your inſolence in dragging in the name of his majeſty on all occaſions, that you may take opportunities of avowing your hoſtility to monarchy in a contemptuous manner, is too obvious to be overlooked. The fraud of your anſwer conſiſts in your magnifying the relative number of Iriſh Romaniſts, and inſinuating, that the rejection of their claim to the legiſlative and executive capacities, firſt ſtarted and purſued by you, is founded on the gratification of the mere whim and caprice of his majeſty, and thereby endeavouring to foſter and encourage their republican opinions, by inſpiring them with a perſonal diſlike to their ſovereign; the reaſons I have before ſtated were urged againſt your meaſure of emancipation, and it was aſſerted, and truly, that ſuch a meaſure would weaken, if not ſubvert, the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment of Ireland, and that his majeſty could never conſent to ſuch a meaſure, becauſe his conſent would be a violation of his coronation oath, by which he ſwore *he would to the utmoſt of his power maintain the Proteſtant reformed religion as eſtabliſhed by law*; but it never was aſſerted or admitted, either in debate or otherwiſe, that the Iriſh Romaniſts would be able to endanger his majeſty's ſafety by a rebellion, in caſe his majeſty ſhould refuſe his conſent to ſuch a meaſure; it was indeed aſſerted, that ſuch a rebellion, (which was repeatedly threatened by you,) would be attended by their own ruin and deſtruction, as was the caſe in former Iriſh rebellions. You ſtate, and for once you ſtate truly, that it was objected to ſuch a meaſure, "that

"it

" it was irreconcileable to the connexion of Ireland with " England," and your anſwer to this objection is the eſſence of deception and ſedition ; it is thus, " Such argument is of " a dangerous and inſulting nature, for it amounts to a de- " claration, that the privileges of a vaſt portion of a nation " ſhould be facrified to another country, that it was not the " old internal queſtion, whether the privileges of one part " of Ireland ſhould be ſacrificed to the ambition of the other, " but whether a vaſt deſcription of the people of Ireland " ſhould be ſacrificed to England ;" you then proceed to ſtate the following caſe : " Suppoſe Ireland the ſeat of government, " and that for the better ſecuring the ſafety of the king here " reſident, and the connexion of Great Britain with Ireland, " that the Iriſh ſhould incapacitate all the Proteſtants of " England, the ſame affection which England on that ſup- " poſition would afford to the Iriſh, the ſame affection has " ſhe now a right to expect from Ireland." Before I com- ment on the venom of this anſwer, I ſhall expoſe its ſophiſtry and inanity ; it is entirely founded on the aſſumption of the following propoſition, that the connexion of the two coun- tries, is ſolely for the advantage of Great Britain, and not for the advantage of Ireland. This propoſition has been maintained by all the Romiſh orators at the aſſembly of the *popular and energetic* Romaniſts at Francis-ſtreet chapel be- fore-mentioned, particularly by Keogh and M'Neven, two of your Romiſh committee ; they indeed went a little further, and ſtated, that the connexion was deſtructive to Ireland : yet no propoſition can be falſer in fact ; the connexion be- tween the two countries is highly advantageous to both, they are each parts of one and the ſame empire, and as the limbs derive life and vigour from the trunk in the human frame, and as its diſmemberment tends to its diſſolution, and the ſeparated limbs loſe all animation before the trunk, the caſe is preciſely the ſame in States and Empires. If Ireland ſhould be ſeparated from Great Britain, the deſtruction of Ireland as an independent nation, muſt precede that of Great Britain. Great Britain might perhaps be able to ſupport her- ſelf in an independent ſtate, though Ireland ſhould be torn from

Connexion of England and Ireland highly advantageous to both, but more particularly to Ireland.

from her, Ireland never could; there is no man, who conſiders the preſent ſtate of Europe, but muſt admit, that Ireland could not by her own ſtrength ſever herſelf from Britain, ſhe muſt be indebted to a foreign nation for effecting ſuch a revolution, if at all practicable; and ſhe muſt conſtantly increaſe that debt to maintain the revolution, until the debt equalled her full value, then ſhe would become the property of the mortgagee, and be reduced to ſlavery for the ſatisfaction of the debt. Let us now compare the ſituation of Ireland connected with Great Britain, with her ſituation, if ſevered from it. At preſent, as one of the French conventioniſts ſtated, the marine has made Europe the miſtreſs of the world, and Great Britain the miſtreſs of Europe. Ireland under the protection of the invincible Britiſh navy, and without being at the expence of a ſingle ſhip of War, exports her manufactures to all parts of the earth, acceſſible to ſhips, ſhe has the full advantage of the trade of the Britiſh colonies and fiſheries, ſhe is protected by the ſame means from all invaſion of foreign enemies, and in the midſt of a war, which has ruined and deſolated the fineſt parts of Europe, ſhe has extended her trade, and manufactures; and if undiſturbed by domeſtic traitors and incendiaries, would have remained in a ſtate of the moſt perfect internal tranquility and proſperity; at the ſame time her public burthens, if eſtimated by her ability and ſecurity, and compared with thoſe of other countries, and even, of part of the Britiſh Empire, are inſignificant.

But what would be the ſituation of Ireland, if ſevered from Great Britain, and on the ſuppoſition that ſhe was able to ſupport herſelf as an independent ſtate, which I have already ſhewn is impracticable; ſhe would in ſuch caſe loſe the protection of the Britiſh navy, ſhe muſt either create a navy at a great public expence, or her foreign trade, without which, being an iſland comparatively ſmall, ſhe could not ſubſiſt, muſt be at the mercy of every other maritime ſtate; and ſuch is the limited nature of her reſources, that ſhe never could hope, in any degree of probable proſperity, to be able to maintain a navy capable of coping with the navies of the great maritime powers of Europe, and ſcarcely with the

ſmaller

ſmaller ones, or with the Barbary pirates: conſequently ſhe muſt be obliged always to crouch beneath the dominion, inſults, and oppreſſion, of ſuch ſtates, and her trade muſt be burthened with taxes and impoſitions equal to the ſupport of a navy; ſhe would be excluded from the whole trade of the Britiſh Weſt Indian colonies, and from the fiſheries of Newfoundland, and the Gulph of St. Lawrence: her manufactures, which by the late regulations in the Eaſt India trade, found their way to the Eaſt, would loſe that mart; her Baltick trade, whence alone ſhe could be ſupplied with naval ſtores, particularly timber, of which ſhe has not now of her own growth, ſufficient to build a wherry, would be interrupted and cut off at the pleaſure of Great Britain, and her channel trade would lie under the ſame diſadvantage; in the event of a war between her and Great Britain (which muſt frequently happen, if our demagogues are to be credited, who aſſert that the commercial intereſts of the two countries are incompatible) all her Eaſtern ports muſt be cloſed, and her foreign commerce annihilated, from Derry to Kinſale; it is evident that internal poverty, miſery, deſolation, and ſubjugation to the horrible tyranny of the French aſſaſſins would in the end be the inevitable fate of Ireland, if ſeparated from the Britiſh Empire; and I conſole myſelf and my countrymen on the impracticability of the ſcheme, even though the execution of it ſhould be undertaken by you, ſir, and your aſſociates. The argument however againſt your emancipation meaſure, as you call it, that it is *irreconcileable to the connexion of England and Ireland*, does not amount to a declaration, that the privileges of a vaſt or of any portion of the inhabitants of Ireland are to be ſacrificed to the intereſts of another country, as you ſtile Great Britain; or as you more emphatically ſtate it, *that a vaſt deſcription of the people of Ireland ſhould be ſacrificed to England*; but it does amount to a declaration, that the Proteſtants of Ireland, one full third of the inhabitants in number, and nineteen parts out of twenty in energy, power, and property, do conceive, that the grant of the legiſlative and higher executive capacities to the other two thirds, who hold principles, as articles of faith, ſubverſive

ſive of the conſtitution of the Britiſh Empire, of which Ireland is but a part, would be highly prejudicial to the intereſts, not of Great Britain alone, but of Ireland alſo, and would be irreconcileable to the connexion between the two countries, in as much as it would tend to ſubvert that conſtitution in Ireland, which is and ought to be, the common conſtitution of the two countries, and to looſe and ſlacken the bands of that connexion on which depends not only the proſperity of Ireland, but its ſalvation ; and which connexion it is more the intereſt of Ireland to preſerve indiſſoluble, than it is of Great Britain, though its preſervation is the intereſt of both ; and in as much alſo as the Romaniſts of Ireland amount to about a ſixth part only of the European population of the Britiſh Empire, and poſſeſs not one hundredth part of its ſtrength and energy, and therefore cannot upon any grounds either of reaſon or civil policy claim ſuch capacities. Another argument to prove that ſuch emancipation would injure the connexion of the two countries, which has been often urged againſt you, and which you have never anſwered, is, that the ſtanding committee of the Iriſh Romaniſts, whom you conſtantly ſtate to be the legitimate repreſentatives of the whole Romaniſts of Ireland, and to whoſe orders and directions a very great portion of the Iriſh Romaniſts have in fact regularly ſubmitted, and who are the perſons whom you ſtile the *popular and energetic part of that communion*, with whom alone of all that body you have any connexion, and who are your organs with that body, have publicly and ſolemnly declared their inveterate and rancorous hoſtility againſt the connexion of England and Ireland ; and their determined purpoſe to attempt a ſeparation of the two countries, and the eſtabliſhment of a republic in Ireland, whenever they ſhall have an opportunity. See their ſpeeches in Francis-ſtreet chapel, publiſhed by the authority of this committee, and other their daily publications in the Romiſh journals.

This caſe, ſir, you have put by no means applies to the arguments uſed againſt your emancipation ſcheme, when fairly explained : To place the excluſion of the Iriſh Roman-

iſts from the legiſlative and higher executive capacities in Ireland (which you ſuppoſe, contrary to fact, to be effected by the Engliſh Proteſtants when it is really effected by the Iriſh Proteſtants) in a ridiculous light, you put your caſe to ſhew, that it would be as reaſonable for the Iriſh Romaniſts, if the King was reſident in Ireland, to incapacitate all the Engliſh Proteſtants, as for the Engliſh Proteſtants, the King reſiding in England, to incapacitate the Iriſh Romaniſts. In the firſt place your caſe is built on a falſity, to wit, that the Engliſh Proteſtants have incapacitated the Iriſh Romaniſts; if called upon, they would, as good ſubjects, aſſiſt the Iriſh Proteſtants in extinguiſhing the flames of rebellion, if they ſhould blaze forth in Ireland on the ſcore of this incapacity, becauſe in ſo doing they would only ſupport the general conſtitution of the Britiſh Empire; but ſuppoſing the ſituation of affairs both in Great Britain and Ireland to be as you have ſtated, I ſhall examine the juſtice of your application of the caſe. The whole inhabitants of Great Britain may be ſaid to be Proteſtants, for the Romaniſts among them are ſo few in number, not being one in two or three hundred, that they may be reputed, what the Mathematicians call, an evaneſcent quantity; the inhabitants are four times more numerous than thoſe of Ireland, and of the inhabitants of Ireland, two-thirds only are Romaniſts; the reſt are Proteſtants: to preſerve any degree of conſiſteney in your caſe, you muſt ſuppoſe the Monarch of the Britiſh Iſlands, reſident in Ireland to be a Romaniſt, and the eſtabliſhed religion to be Romiſh; you then ſuppoſe the Iriſh Romaniſts, not one-ſixth of the inhabitants of the Britiſh iſlands, able to incapacitate the whole inhabitants of the iſland of Great Britain! And you ſtate expreſsly, "*that you were juſtified in making theſe ſuppoſitions;*" your deduction from it is, "*that Ireland is not bound to afford greater affection to England now, than England would be bound to afford to her on the ſuppoſition of the reality of ſuch caſe,*" or in plain Engliſh, that the Romiſh inhabitants of Ireland are now bound to hate and deteſt the inhabitants of Great Britain, as much as the inhabitants of the latter, would be bound to hate and deteſt

the

the inhabitants of the former, if your caſe was real; but your caſe, ſir, will not juſtify your deduction, becauſe it is more conſonant to the rules of juſtice to incapacitate a portion of the inhabitants of one nation part of a great Empire, about one-ſixth part of the inhabitants of that Empire, if their principles are hoſtile to the general conſtitution, than all the inhabitants of another nation part of the ſame Empire, near four times larger than the nation whoſe inhabitants are partially incapacitated, and at leaſt fifty times more powerful; and therefore the Iriſh Romaniſts, in the preſent ſtate of affairs, have leſs right to complain of their incapacity, than the whole inhabitants of Great Britain would have, in the caſe you ſuppoſe, and conſequently their degree of reſentment againſt thoſe who incapacitated them ſhould be leſs; but in truth, ſir, your whole argument, and your caſe compoſe one heap of moſt extravagant abſurdity; you attempt to eſtabliſh by ſtudied falſehood, deception, ſophiſtry, and improbable fictions, the monſtrous doctrine, that the ſtate is guilty of oppreſſion, in excluding from the legiſlative and higher executive capacities, a claſs of ſubjects, ſcarce amounting in number to a ſixth part of the whole; and in power and property, when compared with their fellow ſubjects, inconſiderable; whoſe avowed principles are hoſtile to the eſtabliſhed conſtitution both in church and ſtate.

But notwithſtanding the general flimſineſs and abſurdity of your arguments, which you endeavour at the ſame time to diſguiſe and prop, by aſſuming a kind of dogmatic importance, they are ſufficiently ſupplied with venom and malignity; the ſlaver and ſpume of a toad are not the leſs poiſonous, becauſe they are frothy; and in this laſt argument your malicious purpoſe of animating the Iriſh Romaniſts againſt their Proteſtant fellow ſubjects, Iriſh as well as Engliſh, is eminently prominent. You ſtate that the old internal queſtion in this kingdom was, whether the privileges of one part of Ireland ſhould be ſacrificed to another, intimating that the privileges of the Iriſh Romaniſts have been always heretofore ſacrificed to the ambition of Iriſh Proteſtants; but that now the queſtion is, whether a vaſt deſcription of

the people of Ireland ſhould be ſacrified to England, and that ſuch queſtion is of an inſulting nature, and that it is England which incapacitates the Iriſh Romaniſts: Where you mention the influence of the Engliſh cabinet in Ireland, you aſſert that the nation is under *a foreign yoke*, that is, that England, as to Ireland, is *a foreign* nation, and where you adviſe the Iriſh who are rich and great, ſo ſoon as an inſurrection ſhall break out in Ireland, to join the inſurgents, whom you call the country, you mention the court of England, that is the court of the Empire, as *a remote* court, as the court of a *foreign* prince: at the very time you wrote theſe inflammatory paragraphs, to create and aggravate national animoſities, in ſupport of the joint plan of ſeparation of yourſelf and your colleague Tone, no man knew better than yourſelf that they were all falſe; you well know that the incapacities of the Iriſh Romaniſts were the work of the Iriſh Proteſtants for their own protection, and not of the Engliſh; you well know that the ſeveral acts paſſed in Ireland theſe twenty years laſt paſt for repealing the popery laws, and particularly the act of the year 1793, would never have paſſed the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, had not the intereſt of government, and in fact what is called the Engliſh intereſt, joined the party in the Houſe, which ſupported theſe acts of repeal: when you ſtile Great Britain a foreign nation, and the court of St. James's a foreign court, you ſeem to forget, or at leaſt to overlook, the acts of the Iriſh parliament, declaring Ireland to be inſeparably annexed to, and dependent on, the imperial crown of Great Britain; and the acts enjoining the oath of ſupremacy to be taken in Ireland, the words of which oath are, "that no *foreign* prince, prelate, "ſtate, or potentate, hath or ought to have any juriſdiction, "power, ſuperiority, pre-eminence, or authority, eccleſi-"aſtical or ſpiritual, within this realm;" and that if Great Britain be a foreign country, and the king of it conſequently a foreign prince, the Iriſh Proteſtants by that oath abjure the eccleſiaſtical authority of his majeſty, in direct defiance of our own laws and ſtatutes. But you are ſo ſet upon the execution of your plan, to ſeparate the two nations, that

you

you abandon all pretence to truth and candour in the purſuit, you run head-long into all kinds of abſurdity; and are conſiſtent in one point only, that is, in an inveterate hoſtility againſt the conſtitution of your country in church and ſtate.

Remarks on a pamphlet, entitled, "Some Obſervations on a late Addreſs to the Citizens of Dublin."

A gentleman of learning and ability, lately in a pamphlet entitled, "Some Obſervations on a late Addreſs to the Citizens of Dublin," expoſed with equal ſpirit and truth many of your abſurdities, and many of your falſehoods, contained in this your addreſs. He has proved to a demonſtration, that the preſent diſturbances in this country did not ariſe from the influence of the Britiſh cabinet, from attempts of the miniſter to ſubvert the parliamentary conſtitution by the influence of the crown; nor from the treatment of his majeſty's Catholic ſubjects as aſſerted by you; and he has detected and expoſed your ignorance, and your malice, in your account of what you ſtile with ſuch claſſic elegance (allowing your attic companions, friars O'Leary and Huſſey to be claſſics) the *birth* of the borough *inundation*. There are however ſome points in which I cannot agree with this writer, and as they are points on which much of the public tranquillity depends, and as I eſteem the author to be a friend to the conſtitution, whoſe authority muſt have conſiderable weight, I deem it neceſſary here to examine his arguments on theſe points, and explain my reaſons for diſſenting from him; not as his political antagoniſt, but as a friend to the conſtitution alſo, who when he differs in opinion from any other of its ſupporters, and particularly from a perſon of ſo much ability as the writer, deems it a compliment due to him, to lay before him, and the public, the ground of his opinion.

He ſtates, "that eligibility to certain great offices of the "ſtate, and ſeats in the legiſlature, (that is the legiſlative "and higher executive capacities) have been withheld from "Roman Catholic gentlemen, but not from the lower or- "ders of that communion, becauſe it is morally impoſſible "for men in their rank of life, to attain ſuch ſituations: "that ſuch ineligibility is calculated to wound a very natu- "ral pride in Roman Catholic noblemen and gentlemen, "and to create amongſt them a well warranted diſcontent;

"that

" that it is a ſpecies of ſtigma that muſt be galling to men " of birth and property, that ſuch diſcontent does reign " amongſt the ariſtocracy of the Roman Catholic commu- " nion, that it is to be regretted when in 1793 (the Era of " the paſſing of the laſt act for the relief of Iriſh Roman- " iſts) the political principle, which could alone juſtify Ro- " man Catholic political excluſion, was *totally given up*, that " any of thoſe political excluſions ſhould be ſuffered to re- " main, it was preſerving the hardſhip, and at the ſame " time acknowledging the injuſtice of impoſing it; and then " he concludes, that there is no man who has the capacity " of obſerving and reflecting, who has watched the progreſs " of opinion, who has ſeen the change that within the laſt " three years has in this country, taken place in the Proteſ- " tant mind, and the effects upon the underſtandings of all " men produced by the preſent moſt extraordinary and " eventful times, that muſt not be in his conſcience con- " vinced, that the period cannot be diſtant, nay, that it " muſt be very near, when all heart-burnings and diſſenſions " upon this remaining branch of a queſtion, that in all its " various parts, has ſo long agitated the country, ſhall be " for ever laid aſleep, by the arrival of that happy day for " Ireland, when all her ſons ſhall form but one people, and " the Proteſtant ſhall know of no difference between him " and the Catholic, the Catholic know of none between " him and the Proteſtant, ſave only *that it is at different al-* " *tars, that they worſhip the ſame God.*" Thus, ſir, this au- thor, though he proves that the rejection of the meaſure of Catholic emancipation, as you call it, has not been one of the cauſes of the preſent diſtracted ſtate of the country, yet admits, that it is a meaſure which very ſpeedily will be adopt- ed; and that the legiſlative, and higher executive capacities, will be immediately conceded to the Iriſh Romaniſts, in as full an extent as you can poſſibly contend for; his reaſons briefly are, firſt, that all which has been done for the Iriſh Romaniſts by the repeal of the popery laws has operated in favour of the democracy of that communion, who have not merited it ſo much as the ariſtocracy; and that it is reaſon-

able,

able, that ſomething ſhould be done for the Romiſh ariſtocracy, who have good cauſe to be diſcontented with their preſent ſituation. And, ſecondly, that a great change has happened in the minds of Proteſtants in favour of thoſe claims of the Iriſh Romaniſts within theſe three years laſt paſt. To the firſt reaſon I object, that it ſeems to be advanced without ſufficient conſideration or information on the ſubject, for if the laws enacted in favour of the Iriſh Romaniſts for theſe twenty years laſt paſt are examined, it will be found, that almoſt the whole benefit of them falls to the ſhare of the Romiſh ariſtocracy, and not democracy. The only benefit which the democracy of that communion has acquired by theſe laws is, that the poor Romiſh farmers, or inhabitants of a corporate town, may become voters at elections for members of parliament, and obtain leaſes of land or houſes for lives, or for a longer term than thirty one years; the right of voting at elections for members of parliament ſeems to be of little value to a poor Romiſh forty ſhilling freeholder; and to poor perſons the difference between the value of a leaſe for thirty one years, and a leaſe for lives or a longer term, does not ſeem to be very conſiderable, as their poverty diſables them from paying fines, and therefore they generally pay the full value of the land for rent, and the ſame cauſe prevents them from making valuable improvements. But the Romiſh ariſtocracy, amongſt which I count wealthy men able to purchaſe eſtates, have gained very great advantages by the repeal of the popery laws, ſuch as have eſtates can retain, and ſuch as have money can acquire and retain, their eſtates without impending ruin from bills of diſcovery, gavel laws, profligacy and plunder of their conforming children. The magiſtracy, and all the offices of the ſtate, including army and revenue, are laid open to them (about two and thirty places excepted) a college is erected and endowed by the ſtate for the education of their children, and the Univerſity of Dublin is opened to them for the ſame purpoſe; they are put completely on a footing with all the other ſubjects of the ſtate, in reſpect to all privileges except the legiſlative and higher executive capacities;

capacities; the firſt argument therefore of this author for emancipation, is not as I conceive founded on fact, and therefore has but little weight with me; his ſecond argument, from the change in the minds of Proteſtants in favour of the claims of Romaniſts within theſe three years laſt paſt, I confeſs ſurpriſes me: I never heard, nor can I find from my own experience, that any ſuch change has been effected, nor can I conceive, that any ſuch change in the Proteſtant mind ever will be effected, until Romaniſts ſhall conſent to take the teſt, the rejection of which by them is the ſole cauſe of their preſent incapacity; I conceive myſelf (perhaps erroneouſly) to be a man who has the capacity of obſerving and reflecting; I have watched the progreſs of political opinions, and I never perceived the minds of real Iriſh Proteſtants to be changed in favour of the claims of the Romaniſts to the legiſlative and higher executive capacities; I never heard any real Iriſh Proteſtant maintain the paradox, that it was for the benefit of the ſtate to intruſt the functions of framing laws and executing them, to a claſs of people, who hold it an article of their faith, that the ſtate has but a partial authority to bind them by the laws it enacts, and conſequently that they are in conſcience bound, not only to decline all active obedience to many of theſe laws, but to give them all kind of active reſiſtance; ſome perſons indeed who uſurp the title of Proteſtants, but are in truth infidels, diſciples of Paine, Price, and Prieſtley, and determined republicans, as I have already obſerved, do ſupport ſuch a dogma, becauſe they think, and juſtly, that the propagation of ſuch an opinion amongſt the ſubjects, weakens the ſtate, and aſſiſts their projects of ſubverſion, which muſt commence with anarchy; and the bitter lamentations in the ſeditious prints for the want of what the republicans call public ſpirit, ſhew that ſuch perſons are not ſufficiently numerous or powerful to overturn the ſtate. This writer obſerves, "that at the time "of paſſing the laſt act for the relief of Iriſh Romaniſts, "the political principle which could alone juſtify Roman Ca-"tholic political excluſion, was *totally* given up." I wiſh he had particularly mentioned the political principle, which he

ſuppoſe

ſuppoſed then to have been totally given up: Romaniſts, under certain qualifications, were by that act, enabled to vote at elections of members of parliament; the principle which excluded Romaniſts from that privilege was then given up, but the principle which excluded Romaniſts from the legiſlative and higher executive capacities, was ſo far from being then totally, or at all, given up, that it is particularly preſerved and avowed by the bill, as the author may ſee by peruſing it; and conſequently no injuſtice, as he ſuppoſes, is acknowledged by the bill in preſerving this excluſion; on the contrary, it is defenſible by every rule of reaſon, juſtice and political expediency. This author alſo admits, that what you, ſir, call the influence of the Engliſh cabinet is in ſome degree a grievance in Ireland, and calls for redreſs; and he alſo concedes the expediency and juſtice, if not the neceſſity, of ſome reform in the repreſentation of the people in parliament; aſſerting however, that in the preſent criſis, the attempt to reform would be dangerous, and ſhould be poſtponed to a happier period; and I confeſs, it ſomewhat ſurpriſed and chagrined me, to find, that a man, who had with ſo much ability detected, expoſed, and chaſtiſed, your falſehoods, your miſrepreſentations, your ignorance, and arrogance, in many parts of your addreſs, ſhould thus unaccountably agree with you in the neceſſity of the application of your three propoſed remedies for the diſorders of the ſtate, and in the ſanative qualities of the ingredients of each, particularly of the firſt, your emancipation meaſure, in the fulleſt extent; and in reſpect to the two others, the extinction of the influence of the Engliſh cabinet in Ireland, and the reform of parliament, with conſiderable modifications; as I differ from this writer in my opinions on the three points, and have already given my reaſons againſt the emancipation meaſure, I truſt I ſhall be able in my animadverſions on your reform meaſure, ſatisfactorily to prove that what you call the influence of the Engliſh cabinet, muſt and ought to continue in Ireland, as long as Great Britain and Ireland ſhall form one empire, and monarchy ſhall remain an integral part of our conſtitution; and that the laws of the land

land furniſhed with a few auxiliary proviſions, can afford effectual remedies for any abuſes which may from time to time creep into the conſtitutional mode of election of the repreſentatives of the people in parliament; that no further reform is neceſſary, and that your project of reform, as brought forward in parliament by you and your friends, is but the prelude of the projected ſubverſion of the conſtitution, and the ſubſtitution of a democratic republic in its room, like the ciſalpine republic under the protection of France, that is its vaſſal: and that it is the firſt act only of the tragedy of ſeparation, compoſed by you and your colleague Tone, now in rehearſal by your popular and energetic Romaniſts, and United Iriſhmen, to be performed on the Iriſh ſtage, if the neceſſary and ſuitable decorations, dreſſes, and attendants, to wit, cannon, mortars, muſquets, bayonets, pikes, ſwords, daggers, powder, ball, bombs, and French aſſaſſins, can be procured.

Remarks on Mr. Grattan's account of the creation of boroughs

It is neceſſary however, before I ſtate the plan of reform, propoſed and ſupported by you and your friends in parliament, to make a few remarks on what you ſo elegantly ſtile the *birth* of the *borough inundation* in Ireland; your ravings on this head might excite pity, if falſehood and malignant miſrepreſentation did not appear in every line, chequered with your frenzy: thus you declaim with all the fury of a maniac, mixed with all the falſehood and rancour of a fiend: "Examination into the ſubject had ſhewn that the greater "part of the Iriſh boroughs were creations by the houſe of "Stuart, for the avowed purpoſe of modelling and ſubverting the parliamentary conſtitution of Ireland, that theſe "were underſtated, when called abuſes in the conſtitution, "that they were groſs and monſtrous violations, recent and "wicked innovations, and fatal uſurpations on the conſtitution by kings, whoſe family loſt the throne, for crimes "leſs deadly to freedom, and who in their ſtar-chamber "tyranny, in their court of high commiſſion, in their ſhip-"money, or in their diſpenſing power, did not commit an "act ſo *diabolical* in intention, ſo *mortal* in principle, or ſo "radically ſubverſive of the fundamental rights of the realm,

"as

" as the *fabrication* of boroughs, which is the *fabrication* of " a court parliament, and the excluſion of a conſtitutional " commons; which is a ſubverſion, not of the fundamental " laws, but of the conſtitutional lawgiver; the *birth* of the " *borough inundation* was the deſtruction of liberty and pro- " perty; James the firſt, the king who *made (why did you* " *not ſay begot,)* that inundation, by that means deſtroyed " the titles of his Iriſh *ſubjects* to their lands, without the " leaſt ceremony—the robbery of *his* liberty was immediate- " ly followed by robbery of *his* property *(that is the robbery* " *of the king's liberty was immediately followed by robbery of the* " *king's property.)*

" The king had another inſtrument more ſubtile and more " pliable than the ſword—and againſt the liberty of the ſub- " ject more cold and deadly, a court inſtrument that mur- " ders freedom without the mark of blood—palls itſelf in " the covering of the conſtitution, and in her own *colours*, " and in her name plants the dagger, a *borough parliament.*" You then proceed with your rancorous and falſe invective on the renowned Earl of Strafford, which as it has been already animadverted upon, I ſhall take no further notice of here.

I ſhall omit all comment on the abſurdity of your figures, and your notorious ignorance of grammar, diſplayed in this rant; but it muſt not eſcape reprehenſion, as a heap of diabolical (to uſe your own phraſe) falſehood, and miſrepreſentation. It is an abſolute falſehood, that the king *robbed* (to uſe your own courtly phraſe) any of his Iriſh ſubjects of their lands, or deſtroyed their titles to their lands, by any acts of what you call a borough parliament; the title of the crown to lands of which any Iriſh ſubjects were diſpoſſeſſed in the reign of James the firſt, was founded on the forfeitures of the Iriſh rebels, in the two great rebellions of Deſmond and Tyrone, or on the rules of lawful deſcent and inheritance, according to the uſual courſe of the common law of Ireland, and not upon ſtatute law or acts of parliament; and in this all hiſtorical accounts of theſe times, worthy of that title, agree; it was indeed complained of in thoſe times, that very long poſſeſſion of Iriſh landholders and their anceſ-

tors

tors gave them no title to the lands ſo held againſt very old titles to the ſame lands ſet up by the crown, founded on the maxim of the common law, of *nullum tempus occurrit regi:* and the titles of ſeveral perſons to lands were defeated on legal proof of ſuch old titles by the due courſe of the old common law of the land, and not by act of parliament, and the titles of more were threatened to be queſtioned; but in moſt of ſuch caſes, where forfeiture for treaſon was out of the queſtion, the old poſſeſſor had the land, or a very large portion of it, reſtored to his poſſeſſion, on his agreeing to pay a ſmall rent to the crown, and on very moderate terms of compoſition; and in the caſe of forfeiture for treaſon alſo, the old Iriſh poſſeſſor had a great ſhare of his lands reſtored to him on like moderate terms, ſee Carte's Ormond, 1ſt book, Morriſon, Pacata Hibernia, Sir John Davis, Hume, &c. ſo that here, ſir, you are guilty of aſſerting two direct falſehoods, one that James the firſt deſtroyed the titles of his Iriſh ſubjects to their lands without the leaſt ceremony, meaning without proceſs of law, and contrary to juſtice; and the ſecond, that he did ſo, or in your phraſe that he thus *robbed* them, by the means, or by the agency, of a borough parliament. The following remark on this part of your addreſs I have borrowed from a pamphlet lately publiſhed, ſigned *Vindicator*, a judicious performance, a large extract from which I ſhall inſert as a complete refutation of your equally frantic and wicked declamation, reſpecting what you call the borough inundation, becauſe every thing the writer aſſerts is founded on incontrovertible evidence quoted by him, and which evidence I have carefully examined. The only parliament, ſays Vindicator, which ſat in Ireland during the whole reign of James the firſt, and after his creation of forty boroughs, ſat for three ſhort ſeſſions only, the firſt for twenty-eight days, the ſecond and third ſeſſions for only twenty days each, in all ſomething more than two months—they paſſed ten ſtatutes, they are in the firſt volume of the printed ſtatutes, they neither confiſcated the property of any of James's Iriſh ſubjects themſelves, nor conferred on the crown any powers to enable the king ſo to do; and James, ſo far

from

from making a court inſtrument of the Iriſh parliament, never called another during the remainder of his reign.

Now, ſir, I ſhall proceed to expoſe the infamy and malice of your miſrepreſentations of the whole of the tranſaction of the creation of boroughs by king James the firſt, and of his motives for that creation. Ireland was poſſeſſed for ſeveral ages by the kings of England, under the ſtile of lords, and from the time of Henry the eighth, of kings of Ireland; but whatever ſtile they uſed, they enjoyed not ſo much the reality as the name of dominion in it, for the heads of the Iriſh ſepts never obeyed them, but as they liked, and the body of the people were governed entirely by the Brehon law, and followed the Iriſh cuſtoms; the Engliſh laws indeed were introduced, but were obſerved only in the Engliſh colony, and prevailed no where but in the counties near Dublin, after the rebellion of ſir Caher O'Dogherty was quelled in the reign of James the firſt, and the rebellion meditated by the earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnel prevented, the king, to ſettle the kingdom in tranquillity, to improve the country, and give all ranks and orders of men a full aſſurance of the quiet enjoyment of their liberty and property, took care to have the cuſtoms of taniſtry and gavel kind condemned by judgment in the King's Bench; and utterly aboliſhed the Brehon law in all its branches and uſages; he extended to the aboriginal Iriſh all the privileges of ſubjects, and all the benefit of the Engliſh laws, which he took care to have duly executed without difference or diſtinction of perſons, he encreaſed the number of judges in his courts of law, he divided the whole kingdom into counties, he revived the circuits after two hundred years diſcontinuance in Munſter, and inſtituted them in Connaught, and Ulſter, and ſent itinerant juſtices twice every year to hold aſſizes in every part of the nation for the due and regular adminiſtration of juſtice. Parliaments had from the reign of Edward the ſecond been called from time to time in Ireland upon particular occaſions, but they conſiſted of few members, the number of temporal peers was but ſmall till the reign of Henry the eighth, and of theſe ſome were generally either in rebellion or did not care

to

to attend, and of the ſpiritual, ſuch archbiſhops and biſhops as were reſident in mere Iriſh counties, and did not acknowledge the king for their patron, were never ſummoned to parliament; and as for the Houſe of Commons it ſometimes was compoſed only of the deputies of the four ſhires of the pale (Dublin, Kildare, Meath and Louth,) and writs were never ſent any where but in ſhire ground inhabited by the Engliſh, who continued in obedience to the ſtate, and in ſubjection to the Engliſh laws, for the aboriginal Iriſh in thoſe days were never admitted, as well becauſe their countries lying out of the limits of counties could ſend no knights, and having neither cities nor boroughs in them, could ſend no burgeſſes, to the parliament, as becauſe they were deemed enemies, and unfit to be truſted in the great council of the realm, for before the thirty-fourth year of Henry the eighth, when Meath was divided into two ſhires, there were no more than twelve counties in Ireland (there were only eleven, *ſee thirty third Henry eighth, chapter* 2.) beſides the liberty of Tipperary, and as the ancient cities were but four, and the boroughs which ſent burgeſſes not above thirty, the entire body of the Houſe of Commons could not then conſiſt of one hundred perſons; queen Mary indeed added two ſhires, reducing the counties of Leix and Offaley into counties, (the King's and Queen's counties) and erecting boroughs in them, whereby they were qualified to ſend knights and burgeſſes to parliament; and afterwards queen Elizabeth, in ſir Henry Sidney's and ſir John Perrott's times, erected ſundry counties in Connaught and Ulſter, yet no knights were ever ſent from the remote parts of the latter province; the laſt parliament held in her time was called in the twenty-ſeventh year of her reign (it conſiſted of one hundred and twenty-two members, *ſee Rolls office)* and twenty-ſeven years of troubleſome and unſettled times, had paſſed ſince without the ſummons of any; but king James having now ſettled Ireland in peace, divided the whole kingdom into counties, and erected forty new boroughs in the ſeventeen counties laſt appointed, reſolved to call a general repreſentation of the whole nation, in which all the inhabitants thereof whether of the old Engliſh extraction

or

or the new Britiſh colony, or the old Iriſh natives, ſhould meet together to make laws for the common good of themſelves and their poſterity, *ſee Carte's Ormond, pages* 11, 13, 18, *and* 19.

The authority of the above account of this the firſt introduction amongſt the whole inhabitants of Ireland as a nation, of a parliamentary conſtitution by king James the firſt, on the exact model of the Engliſh parliamentary conſtitution, does not reſt ſolely on the authority of Mr. Carte, whoſe ability, induſtry, learning, and candour, entitle him to great credit; the ſtatutes and records of the kingdom prove it beyond contradiction. In the ſtatute of the 28th Henry ſixth, chapter 2. A. D. 1450, only four counties are named as poſſeſſing the benefit of Engliſh laws, viz. Dublin, Kildare, Meath and Uriel or Louth,—and ſeventy-two years afterwards, A. D. 1522, in the 13th Henry eighth, chapter 3. are theſe remarkable words, "*becauſe that right few perſons within the four ſhires where the kings laws is occupied in this land.*"

A. D. 1570. in the 12th Elizabeth, chapter 3. the ſhires and towns then obeying the Engliſh laws, are enumerated, and they only amount to nine counties; and it is to be obſerved, that two of thoſe, viz. the King and Queen's counties, had been a very ſhort time created, and that the apparent addition of another county was owing to the diviſion of Meath into two counties; thus from the year 1456 to the year 1570, a period of 120 years, only four counties were added to the original four counties of the Pale, which obeyed the Engliſh laws: It is true that in the 33d Henry the eighth, chapter 2. A. D. 1542, an act for the election of the Lord Juſtice, eleven counties are named, but it does not follow, that all thoſe had the benefit of the Engliſh laws, or parliamentary conſtitution. Theſe counties are named merely as the places of *reſidence* of the King's *Counſaylers*, who were to be aſſembled in caſe of the death of a Lieutenant, Deputy or Juſtice, in order to chuſe another; ſome great Lords lived in Munſter, who were certainly of the King's Council, yet into whoſe territories (for they were petty princes) the King's writ never ran, nor had the inhabitants in any ſhape the benefit of the Engliſh

Engliſh laws. For though Munſter had been long nominally divided into counties, yet ſir John Davis obſerves, "The "people were ſo degenerate as no Juſtice of aſſize durſt ex- "ecute his commiſſion among them." Five of the counties named in this act, were ſituated in Munſter, and certainly by the concurrent teſtimony of all the writers upon the ancient ſtate of Ireland, came under this deſcription. This reduces the number of counties named in this act, which had really the benefit of Engliſh laws, and parliamentary conſtitution, to ſix.

By the 34th Henry the 8th, chap. 1. Meath was divided into two counties, and the reaſon aſſigned for this diviſion in the preamble of the act was, "That even in this ancient "county of the Pale in ſeveral parts thereof, the king's "writs, for lack of miniſtration of juſtice, have not of late "been obeyed, ne his graces lawes put in due exerciſe." This made the number of counties ſeven. Philip and Mary after added the king's and queen's counties, which increaſed the number to nine, and this is preciſely the number mentioned in the 12th Elizabeth, chap. 3. A. D. 1570. From this period no counties were made by act of parliament; but by the 11th Elizabeth, chapter 9. A. D. 1569, powers were given to the chancellor or keeper of the great ſeal for the time being, to award commiſſions for that purpoſe. This parliament of Elizabeth which conferred theſe powers was diſſolved in 1571, and ſhe never ſummoned more than one parliament after, which ſat but a ſhort time, being aſſembled 26th of April, 1685, prorogued 25th of May following; aſſembled again 26th of April, 1686, and diſſolved 26th of May following. So that the act giving the power of creating counties to the chancellor, &c. if carried into execution, could not be of much advantage to the parliamentary conſtitution during her reign; but in truth the intention of it never was compleatly fulfilled during her reign. Sir Henry Sydney, and after him Sir John Perrott, did endeavour to give effect to this act. The latter divided Ulſter nominally into ſeven ſhires, but Sir John Davis obſerves, "The law "was never executed in theſe new counties, by any ſheriffs

"or

" or juſtices of aſſize, but the people were left to be ruled " ſtill by their own barbarous lords and laws." Thus a very ſmall portion indeed of theſe new counties returned members to the only parliament which prior to the 13th of James the firſt had been called in Ireland for the ſpace of 42 years; that parliament ſummoned by James, and meeting in May, 1613, being the firſt parliament called by James in Ireland. There is indeed irrefragable proof of this in the rolls office. The number of members who were ſummoned in the laſt parliament of Elizabeth in the 27th year of her reign, A. D. 1585, was 122, the numbers ſummoned to James's parliament in 1613, amounted to 232, difference 110: But James had created only ſort boroughs, which returned only eighty members, conſequently thirty repreſentatives for counties, that is the repreſentatives of fifteen counties muſt have ſat in James's firſt parliament in 1613, which never before ſat in parliament, and yet in the laſt preceding parliament of Elizabeth more counties were repreſented than at any former period whatſoever: If James then created 40 boroughs to increaſe the borough repreſentation, he muſt at the ſame time be allowed to have encreaſed alſo the county repreſentation to a great degree, by adding to it the repreſentation of many counties, which though nominally created before, had never before been actually repreſented: Thus it is notorious, that this firſt parliament of James the firſt, formed the very firſt parliamentary conſtitution, of which the *Iriſh nation* (contradiſtinguiſhed from the Engliſh ſettlers) ever poſſeſſed the ſmalleſt participation. This is a fact not only eſtabliſhed by the concurrent teſtimony of every writer on the affairs of Ireland, but is put beyond the poſſibility of controverſy by the acts of that very parliament: The 5th chap. of its ſtatutes, contains a repeal of ſome very extraordinary acts, one ſo late as the 28th Henry 8th, another ſtill later, the 11th of Elizabeth, whence it will clearly appear that this parliament was the firſt that ever ſat in Ireland, which placed the Iriſh nation on the ſame footing with the Engliſh ſettlers, which communicated to them the benefit of the Engliſh laws, or ſuffered them to participate in the benefits of a

parliamentary conſtitution: and was the firſt parliament in which the whole nation was fairly repreſented; and this parliamentary conſtitution for the whole kingdom was the work of James the firſt, framed on the exact model of the Engliſh conſtitution, and for which the memory of that benevolent monarch deſerves to be held in veneration by every inhabitant of Ireland from generation to generation, and which will, whilſt hiſtory or records ſhall be extant, ſecure his character from the malicious attacks of envenomed traitors.

The motives of James the firſt, for the creation of 40 boroughs are plain and notorious; firſt and principally he deſigned to frame the parliamentary conſtitution of the *whole* kingdom of Ireland, of which he was the founder, on the exact model of that of England; he had in effect created fifteen new counties, becauſe it appears from what has been already proved, that thirty repreſentatives for counties ſat in his firſt parliament which had not ſat in the laſt of Elizabeth nor in any preceding parliament: in the counties which ſhe had created in Connaught, the repreſentatives of ſome of which might have ſat in her laſt parliament, ſhe could not have created many boroughs, if any at all; 122 members were ſummoned to her laſt parliament, in preceding parliaments the number ſummoned was about 100, ſo that ſhe may be ſaid to have increaſed the number of repreſentatives by 22, ſhe muſt therefore have created ſome boroughs, but not many, becauſe ſhe certainly did not ſummon the repreſentatives of fifteen new counties, ſhe ſummoned only the repreſentatives of 17 counties in all, as James brought in the repreſentatives of 15 counties never before repreſented, and the whole number of counties in the kingdom is but 32. In the parliament of the 12th of Elizabeth the repreſentatives of nine counties only were ſummoned, in that of the 27th of her reign, her laſt parliament, the number of repreſentatives exceeded that of the 12th of her reign by 22, yet 17 counties only were then repreſented, that is eight counties more than were repreſented in her former parliament, the repreſentatives of which eight counties, amounted to 16; ſhe muſt then have created three new boroughs before the

ſitting

ſitting of her laſt parliament to compleat the number of 22 new repreſentatives: Mr. Carte tells us that king James created theſe 40 boroughs in the 17 laſt created counties; now if king James had not created theſe 40 boroughs in the laſt 17 created counties, 15 of the counties repreſented in the laſt parliament of Elizabeth, that is leſs than one half of the kingdom, having all the then exiſting boroughs ſituated in them, would have returned 118 members of parliament, and the remaining ſeventeen counties, more than half of the kingdom, to wit, all Ulſter, Connaught, and part of Munſter, would have returned in the whole to parliament only 34 members; which would be ſo very unequal a repreſentation, that it could not be alleged to have been framed on the Engliſh model; the real and perſonal property of the nation in general would not be fairly repreſented; the repreſentatives of the old Engliſh colony would remain the repreſentatives in fact of the whole nation, as their deſcendants were chiefly in poſſeſſion of that part of the kingdom which would return 118 of the repreſentatives; and the new Engliſh and Scotch ſettlers, and the great bulk of the native Iriſh inhabiting the 17 new counties, would in a manner be excluded from parliamentary repreſentation, or deprived of all intereſt or influence in it, as their repreſentatives in parliament would amount to 34 only. At the time James the firſt undertook the civilizing of this kingdom, and introducing into it, a regular government and conſtitution on the Engliſh model, three-fourths of it were nearly in as barbarous a ſtate as the countries inhabited by the ſavages in North America; the native Iriſh reſided in foreſts and moraſſes, their chiefs were elective, the barbarian who excelled in ferocity and ſtrength, was always elected the head of the clan, or the ſachem of the tribe; he led them out to war, always undertaken for the purpoſe of plundering a neighbouring tribe, or the Engliſh coloniſts; the diſtrict belonging to a tribe was parcelled out among them by the chief, or the ſachem, in ſuch proportions as he thought fit, and the partition was revocable at his pleaſure, whilſt he retained his power, which however was very precarious in its duration; a ſtronger and

fiercer ſavage generally ending his domination by the application of the ſkeyn or dagger; and on the election of a new chief, a new diviſion of the diſtrict amongſt the tribe took place; the portion occupied by the head of a family, on his death was divided amongſt all his children, baſtards included, who were conſidered on a level with the legitimate children; theſe family partitions were ſtill ſubject to the general partitions amongſt the tribe at the will of the chief, and at every ſucceſſion of a chief. Theſe modes of ſucceſſion to the chiefry of a tribe, and of partition of lands, were the principal parts of the Brehon law, and were called Taniſtry and Gavelkind; in truth this Brehon law, as it was called, was nothing more than a ſyſtem of barbarous cuſtoms originating in ſavage life, and calculated for ſuch a life only; it is, when examined, the ſyſtem of that moſt enlightened modern philoſopher Tom Paine the ſtaymaker, which he ſtiles, the Rights of Man. Theſe ſavage Iriſh had no towns in their diſtricts. Engliſh coloniſts had on ſome parts of the ſea coaſts built ſome towns for the advantage of commerce, which however they were obliged to fortify for their own protection; they did indeed ſow ſome corn, as do the ſavages in North America, and on the crop, and their herds of cattle they ſubſiſted; they were univerſally attached with the blindeſt bigotry to the Romiſh profeſſion, yet ſet at nought all the moral precepts of chriſtianity, and were chriſtians more in name than reality; their ignorance was extreme, and if we are, ſir, to believe your colleague Tone, in the account of Ireland which he lately drew up for the uſe of the French convention, to induce them to invade this country, the bulk of the Iriſh nation are not yet civilized; for in that account he deſcribes the Iriſh peaſantry as now in a *ſemibarbarous ſtate*, and your *popular* and *energetic* Romaniſts *the United Iriſhmen*, by their recent moſt inhuman murders, have ſhown that your colleague's picture of them is a juſt one. Elizabeth had compleatly vanquiſhed and ſubjugated theſe barbarians, and the benevolent James ſucceeding her, determined to beſtow upon them a regular government, and to teach them the arts of civilized life; for this purpoſe he found

it

it neceſſary to introduce amongſt them large colonies of Engliſh and Scotch ſettlers, an induſtrious and frugal race, ſkilled in agriculture and manufactures, they built towns, cut down foreſts, cultivated the lands, and eſtabliſhed manufactures, trade, and commerce in this kingdom; they were all proteſtants, they were bred up in the principles of a free repreſentative conſtitution; which though ſomewhat different in England and Scotland, yet in its leading principles was common to both countries; perſonal property by their means was infinitely increaſed in this kingdom, particularly in the ſeventeen newly created counties. It is the known principle of the Britiſh Conſtitution, founded on wiſdom and juſtice, that perſonal property ſhall be repreſented in parliament, as well as real property. That conſtitution had veſted the power of determining, what portion of the people ſhould be permitted to vote for repreſentatives of the perſonal property of the nation in parliament, in the crown, as part of the prerogative; that power from the reign of Henry the 3d down to that of William the 3d had been from time to time exerciſed by the crown, in granting charters of incorporation to certain towns according to its diſcretion, empowering the perſons deſcribed in ſuch charters to elect and ſend to parliament repreſentatives of ſuch towns, called boroughs; by the perſons ſo elected is repreſented in parliament the bulk of the perſonal property of the nation, as that of the real property is repreſented in the Houſe of Commons by the knights of the ſhires; and both real and perſonal property, by the repreſentatives of cities and towns, which are at the ſame time both counties and corporations; as is the caſe in many places in this kingdom; juſtice, wiſdom, the principles of the Britiſh conſtitution, all conſpired with political expediency, in impelling James to give the ſame conſtitution to *all* Ireland, which had been for ages eſtabliſhed throughout England, and partially in Ireland; that is in the Engliſh colony in Ireland, in which borough repreſentation had been introduced very ſhortly after it had been eſtabliſhed in England; civil liberty owed its very birth in England to the borough repreſentation, all hiſtorians concur in atributing

ing to the creation of boroughs, the mitigation of the rigour of the feudal ſyſtem, a military ariſtocratic domination, which reduced the bulk of the nation to the moſt abject ſlavery, the moſt degrading ſubjection, under the iron yoke of haughty tyrants, poſſeſſing almoſt the whole landed property of the country, and holding the maſs of the people in vaſſalage and bondage: the borough repreſentation broke the chains of this military tyranny, and eſtabliſhed our preſent conſtitution, the perfection of reaſon, and at once the envy and admiration of all ſurrounding nations. The new Proteſtant coloniſts of James had been born under a free conſtitution, they did not deſerve to loſe it, by adventuring their lives and properties, by exerting their arts and their induſtry, in colonizing a ſavage country, for the advantage as well of their native country, as of that into which they had been tranſplanted; neither their lives, their properties, or their religion could be protected, without giving them a conſtitution ſimilar to that under which they had been born; they had a right, an indefeaſible right to it: James on his acceſſion to the crown of England met with great oppoſition from the Romaniſts of Ireland, the old Engliſh colony was for the moſt part attached to the Romiſh perſuaſion, the barbarous Iriſh natives were all ſo; the inhabitants of many of the principal cities and towns flew to arms on his acceſſion, and refuſed to acknowledge him; and did ſo afterwards, only on being compelled by a military force; in the parliament called by him after the creation of the 40 boroughs in 1613, there were 101 Romaniſts in direct oppoſition to him, and hoſtile, in the moſt inveterate degree, to his Proteſtant colonies; the elections, for knights of the ſhire for all the new counties went in favour of the Romaniſts, and had it not been for the creation of the 40 boroughs, there would have been a majority of four to one againſt the Proteſtant intereſt; and as it was, James had only 105 againſt 101. From the bigotted and ferocious principles of the Iriſh Romaniſts of that day, there can be no doubt, but that all the ſchemes of James for civilizing and planting the kingdom, and for introducing arts, manufactures, and commerce, would have been

been defeated, his colonies of induſtrious Proteſtants ſettled in the ſeventeen new counties, amongſt a race juſt emerging from barbariſm, rooted out, and the nation again overwhelmed with all the miſeries attendant on anarchy, civil war, and rebellion, had he not created theſe 40 boroughs; which however, independent of the above conſideration, he was bound by the principles of the Britiſh conſtitution to create, when he undertook to eſtabliſh that conſtitution throughout the *whole* kingdom of Ireland. From that period to the revolution, as this kingdom increaſed in population, in trade, and in the number of towns, the ſucceeding princes exerted their undoubted prerogative, in increaſing the number of boroughs, as by the principles of the conſtitution they were bound to do; no principles of the conſtitution being better eſtabliſhed than theſe; that the actual repreſentation of the people in parliament, is not the repreſentation of numbers, but of property; (the lower and poorer claſſes of the people being the majority in numbers, are virtually repreſented only) that perſonal property is as well entitled to repreſentation as real; and that the repreſentatives of corporate towns which are not counties, are the repreſentatives of perſonal property. The perſonal property of the nation had increaſed aſtoniſhingly between the ſitting of the only parliament which James had ever ſummoned in Ireland, in 1613, and the year 1640; the improvement of the kingdom in that period, and particularly during the government of the great Earl of Strafford, I have already ſtated; the ſhipping of the kingdom alone, was encreaſed one hundred fold in that period: previous to the reign of Charles the ſecond, another great colony of induſtrious Engliſhmen were ſettled in Ireland on the lands forfeited by the great Iriſh Rebellion in 1641, and during the reign of Charles the ſecond, the improvement of the kingdom encreaſed with ſurprizing rapidity; as may be ſeen by Lord Chief Juſtice Keatinge's repreſentation of the ſtate of the kingdom at the commencement of the revolution war, preſerved in Archbiſhop King's ſtate of the Proteſtants of Ireland; the immenſe, and almoſt incredible increaſe of perſonal property in the nation during the

the reign of James the firſt, Charles the firſt and ſecond, required an increaſed repreſentation of perſonal property, that is an increaſe of boroughs; hence it is, that 34 boroughs were added to the repreſentation from 1613 to the acceſſion of king William and queen Mary; none have been ſince added, for though no burgeſſes were ſummoned from the borough of Enniſcorthy, in the firſt parliament held in Ireland after the acceſſion of William and Mary, as appears by the Commons Journals, yet burgeſſes were ſummoned from it in the parliament of James the firſt in 1613, and in the firſt parliament of Charles the ſecond, in 1661, ſo that the ancient charter of that borough was renewed ſince the revolution, the borough was not newly created. And now, ſir, I think I have fully expoſed the wickedneſs of your miſrepreſentation, "that the Iriſh boroughs for the "greater part were creations by the houſe of Stewart, for "the avowed purpoſe of ſubverting the parliamentary con- "ſtitution of Ireland, and that they are groſs and mon- "ſtrous violations, recent and wicked innovations, and fatal "uſurpations on the conſtitution, diabolical in intention, "mortal in principle, and radically ſubverſive of the funda- "mental rights of the realm." For I have demonſtrated from hiſtory and records, that the creations of boroughs by the houſe of Stewart, were not only warrantable exertions of the prerogative of the crown founded on the known laws of the realm, but on reaſon, on juſtice, and even political neceſſity; that the Era of the creation of boroughs is the Era of the birth of conſtitutional liberty; that the Britiſh conſtitution and its benefits civil and religious, could not have been communicated to *all* Ireland, and to *all* its natives and inhabitants, in a juſt and reaſonable meaſure, or at all, without the creation of boroughs by James the firſt; that that creation of boroughs by James the firſt, was coeval with the communication of the Britiſh conſtitution, to *all* the inhabitants of Ireland without diſtinction; and that if it is recent and an innovation, the communication of the Britiſh conſtitution to *all* the inhabitants of Ireland, is alſo recent and an innovation; that it was not diabolical, but benevolent, in intention;

tention; not mortal, but vivifying, in principle; not radically ſubverſive, but radically ſtabilitive, of the fundamental rights of the realm. It is alſo evident, that borough repreſentation prevails as much in proportion in Great Britain as in Ireland; from all which I deduce, that your infamous miſrepreſentation of the creation of boroughs in Ireland, by the houſe of Stewart, of its purpoſes and effects, is (to uſe your own phraſe) *diabolical* in intention; and that it is very difficult to determine, on reading it, whether your ignorance or your malice is moſt predominant.

Mr. Grattan's plan of reform in repreſentation explained and expoſed.

Now, ſir, I ſhall proceed to ſtate the great outlines of the plan of reform which was propoſed in the laſt parliament, and ſupported by you and your party: I did then and do now ſuppoſe, that it was entirely framed by you, though you procured another gentleman to propoſe it—becauſe he contented himſelf with barely propoſing it, leaving to you the taſk of ſupporting it, which you performed with the greateſt zeal; becauſe I look on your views as fully equal to the miſchief it was calculated to produce; and becauſe I do not believe, the gentleman who propoſed it, had duly weighed the conſequences of ſuch a plan, if adopted, or by any means ſaw it in the ſame light in which it ſtrikes me, and in which I think myſelf fully competent to expoſe it to the eye of the public; I am very ſure if he had ſeen it in the ſame light, that his heart would have revolted from it: And I admit your powers of deception to be very conſiderable, when you were able ſo effectually to diſguiſe its helliſh deformity, as to prevail on him to introduce it into the Houſe of Commons. Another ground of my belief that you were at leaſt the adoptive father of it, is, that it ſtrongly reſembles the mode of repreſentation eſtabliſhed by the French democrats, with which your colleague Tone was perfectly well acquainted; and it is not impoſſible that he might have communicated with you on the ſubject; you know, ſir, at leaſt the public now know, he has been lately in England incog. in the exerciſe of his office as incendiary and French ſpy, and he is now probably in France, and it is currently reported, and generally credited, that he attended the negociation

gociation at Liſle, as one of the agents of your *popular and energetic Romaniſts, the United Iriſhmen*; for they had two there, as the Iriſh prints in their pay have univerſally aſſerted; and the ſame channels have conveyed to us the intelligence, that their indefatigable exertions defeated the negociation. The firſt part of your propoſed reform, was what you ſtiled the emancipation of the Roman Catholics, that is, the admiſſion of them into the Houſes of Parliament, and into all the great offices of the ſtate, as well of political adminiſtration, as of juriſprudence; without the teſt: this you declared was ſo eſſentially neceſſary to your reform, that without it there could be no reform whatſoever: your principal view in introducing your reform, with this meaſure in the front, was to attach all the Iriſh Romaniſts of every deſcription, not only your *popular and energetic Romaniſts, the United Iriſhmen*, the profeſſed republicans and aſſaſſins the Catilinarian gang, of whoſe aid you were aſſured, but the reſpectable and hitherto loyal part of that communion, to your party. The ſecond part of your reform was the diſſolution, utter ſubverſion and annihilation of all corporations of every kind, in cities, towns and boroughs, which enjoyed the privilege of ſending repreſentatives to parliament, with all their franchiſes; and the diviſion of the nation into *departments*, each department to contain five thouſand houſes; and as by the hearth-money books the whole kingdom was computed to contain ſeven hundred thouſand houſes, reputing every wretched cabin, a houſe; it would be divided into one hundred and forty departments, each of which was to ſend two members to parliament, amounting in the whole to two hundred and eighty members, elective by the votes, not of the freeholders, but of the houſeholders in each department. The county repreſentation, and mode of election, was not to be altered, ſo that ſixty-four county members would remain in the Houſe of Commons, which added to two hundred and eighty, would make the whole number of repreſentatives in the Iriſh Houſe of Commons amount to three hundred and ſixty four; almoſt two-thirds of the number of the Britiſh commoners: although Great Britain is nearly

four

four times larger than Ireland, in population in the ſame proportion at leaſt, and in wealth and real ſtrength and energy, fifty times greater. The remaining parts of your project of reform, I ſhall omit, as they are only minutiæ, and the two recited parts forming the great outline of it, are ſufficient for my purpoſe.

This project of reform, at one ſtroke cuts down by the root, the parliamentary conſtitution of Ireland, modelled exactly from that of England; all corporations repreſentable in parliament are to be aboliſhed; and that renowned inſtitution to which Great Britain owes her liberty, her property, and her glory, which ſhe tranſplanted into this kingdom, and which is here coeval with the conſtitution, eſtabliſhed on the expulſion or rather ſubjugation of barbariſm, is, in the military ſenſe of the word, to be *reformed*; that is, annihilated; Magna Charta, which ſecures to the ſubjects all their franchiſes, is to be defeated; freemen are to loſe their franchiſes; corporations are to be diſſolved, without quo warrantos or informations in the nature of quo warrantos, founded on abuſes; becauſe freemen in ſuch caſes would have a right by law to defend their franchiſes, and might defeat ſuch attempts; and the old common law, aided by ſtatute law, founded on juſtice and reaſon, would not ſerve your turn. When the public good demands the ſacrifice of the private property of a ſubject, or of the franchiſe of a corporation, compenſation is always made for the loſs; no compenſation is offered by your ſcheme to the freemen to be disfranchiſed for the loſs of their franchiſes: But the injuſtice to individuals is not the moſt noxious part of your propoſed doſe for remedying the alleged maladies of the ſtate, the intereſt of individuals, I admit, muſt give way to the general intereſt of the whole community; the deadly effect of ſuch a poiſonous drug on the body politic, and the felonious adminiſtration of it, I mean to explain, prevent, and reprobate.

A very few years ſince, a bill was brought into parliament in Ireland, for reducing the hearth-money tax by exempting a certain claſs of the inhabitants from the payment of it on account

account of their poverty. It was then ſtated to the Houſe on calculations made from the books of the hearth-money collectors, as I have before mentioned, that there were two millions one hundred thouſand inhabitants in this kingdom, who ought to be exempted from that tax on account of their poverty. This tax, on a houſe, or rather cabin, having but one fire hearth, was no more than two ſhillings and two pence, yearly, that is one halfpenny per week, computing the inhabitants of theſe houſes or cabins, having but one fire-hearth each, at five to a houſe, the number of houſeholders in the whole kingdom, ſo poor that they could not without the greateſt diſtreſs pay a tax to the ſtate of one halfpenny per week, amounts to four hundred and twenty thouſand, the remaining houſeholders inhabiting houſes having each two fire-hearths, or more, amount, by the ſame mode of calculation, to about three hundred thouſand, and by the bill for reducing the hearth-money tax, all houſes having but one fire-hearth, were exempted from payment of that tax, the owner performing certain requiſites ſpecified in the bill, and they were chargeable with no other; ſo here are four hundred and twenty thouſand houſeholders in Ireland exempted from all taxes on account of their poverty, and who by your ſcheme are each to have an equal right of voting for repreſentatives in parliament, with each of the other three hundred thouſand houſeholders occupying houſes with two fire-hearths and upwards. And of theſe three hundred thouſand houſeholders, a great proportion are perſons of very ſmall properties, yet by your ſcheme the beggar occupying a cottage, the working artizan, or labourer, inhabiting a houſe with two fire-hearths, one half of it perhaps let to another family, were to have an equal right of voting for repreſentatives in parliament, with the men of large real and perſonal property; and if ſuch a man happened to have two houſes, one in a city and one in the country, in the ſame department, he was not to have a vote for each houſe, but a vote for one only: And as the number of houſeholders inhabiting cabins with one fire-hearth, ſo wretchedly poor, that they cannot afford to pay one halfpenny per week, as a tax

for

for the ſupport of the ſtate, exceeds the number of all the other houſeholders in the nation put together, and as amongſt the houſeholders inhabiting houſes with two fire-hearths or more, the number of poor artizans procuring their livelihood by manual labour, and of other poor perſons, infinitely exceed the number of wealthy houſeholders; two hundred and eighty members of the Houſe of Commons would, by your ſcheme, be elected by the beggars, the labourers, the artizans depending for their exiſtence on their daily labour, and by other indigent claſſes of the community, and the only repreſentation of all real and perſonal property in the Houſe of Commons would conſiſt of ſixty-four members, the repreſentatives of counties. By your ſcheme the Romaniſts are to be admitted into both houſes of parliament without the teſt, and to ſhew that by your ſcheme the infinite majority of the electors of two hundred and eighty members of the Houſe of Commons would be Romaniſts, I ſhall reſort firſt to the authority of your colleague Mr. Tone, in his aforeſaid ſtate of Ireland, drawn up for the uſe of the French convention, and ſecondly, to your own authority. Mr. Tone writes thus: "The Catholics, *the great body of the* "*people*, are in the loweſt degree of ignorance, the whole "peaſantry of Ireland, the moſt oppreſſed and wretched "in Europe, may be ſaid to be Catholic. In Ireland, the "name of England and her power is univerſally odious; the "Catholics are enemies to the Engliſh power from a hatred "to the Engliſh name. The intereſt of the Iriſh ariſtocrats" (that is, the Proteſtants and gentry poſſeſſed of eſtates) "is "adverſe to that of the people, their own tenantry would "deſert and turn againſt them." And now, ſir, I ſhall quote your own authority to eſtabliſh the ſame point. You aſſert in your addreſs that three-fourths of the inhabitants of Ireland are Romaniſts: (I admit two-thirds are ſo) as all the inhabitants muſt occupy houſes, and as the Iriſh cabins, the moſt numerous claſs of houſes, contain in general but one family each, the number of houſes in the kingdom inhabited by Proteſtants and Romaniſts muſt be in nearly the ſame proportion, if the ratio, in favour of the Romaniſts does

not

not exceed; as the inhabitants of cabins, holding only one family each, are almoſt entirely Romaniſts; hence by your own calculation the Romiſh electors would exceed the Proteſtant in proportion of three to one at leaſt. In the preſent ſtate of the elective franchiſe, the Proteſtant electors infinitely exceed the Romaniſts, for the landed eſtates are moſtly in the hands of Proteſtants, and the corporators are almoſt all Proteſtants; your ſcheme therefore is calculated utterly to root out the Proteſtant intereſt in Ireland, as the prelude of your project of ſeparation. Thus it is clear as well from your own authority, as that of your colleague Mr. Tone, that the great body of electors of two hundred and eighty members of the Houſe of Commons, would conſiſt of beggars, labourers, and poor artizans of the kingdom, all Romaniſts, who, according to Mr. Tone, hate and abhor the Engliſh name; that is, as I have before ſhewed, all Proteſtants; it could not be expected, or hoped for, that ſuch electors would elect Proteſtant repreſentatives, they would to a certainty elect Romaniſts, and ſuch only as manifeſted the greateſt hatred and malevolence to Proteſtants; and for the moſt part men of deſperate fortunes, your *popular and energetic Romaniſts*, the leaders of the murderous aſſociation of United Iriſhmen; and in ſhort, the chiefs of the Catilinarian gang of aſſaſſins and robbers, who now infeſt the country, would be the perſons elected: and pre-eminence in every kind of wickedneſs would be a certain title to the ſuffrages of ſuch electors. Thus four-fifths, if not five-ſixths of the Houſe of Commons, would conſiſt of Romaniſts, men of ſmall or of no property, of aſſaſſins, and robbers, enemies of the Britiſh Empire, their animoſity againſt Proteſtants inflamed, as well by bigotry, envy of their proſperity, and avarice, as by the received opinions of them all, that their Proteſtant fellow ſubjects are uſurpers of the eſtates of their anceſtors: and rendered more deſperate, dangerous, and inclined to war, by their ignorance, ſemibarbarity, and poverty, according to Mr. Tone. The principle of the conſtitution, and on which borough repreſentation was originally inſtituted, viz. That property, not numbers, ought to be *actually*

tually repreſented in the Houſe of Commons, would be compleatly overturned; numbers would prevail over property, and the purſe of the nation, excluſively truſted to that Houſe by the conſtitution, would be torn from the cuſtody of the opulent, from whoſe coffers all its treaſures are collected and recruited, and delivered over to the indigent and needy, whoſe poverty not only diſables them from contributing one mite to its contents, but would moſt certainly invite and induce them to peculation and plunder of the public, to ſupply their wants and gratify their avarice and all other vices: The immediate conſequences would be, the overturning the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment in church and ſtate, public diſtreſs, murder, baniſhment, plunder, confiſcation, and a rebellion to ſever this country from the Britiſh Empire. Your coadjutor Mr. Tone could not have deviſed a better engine for carrying on his project of ſeparation, than your ſcheme of reform, if carried into execution; which induces me ſtrongly to ſuſpect, as I have already hinted, that it is not entirely of your own invention, but that you had the benefit of his aſſiſtance at leaſt. In vain would the legal authority of the crown and the Houſe of Lords ſtruggle againſt the deſperate enterprizes of ſuch a Houſe of Commons; every one acquainted with the hiſtory of his own country in the ſlighteſt degree, knows the immenſe powers in the ſtate claimed, acquired, and exerciſed by the Houſe of Commons ſince the extinction of the line of Tudor; and the limitation and reduction of the prerogative of the crown. It is very clear that the Houſe of Commons, conſidering its preſent powers, if all influence of the crown, peerage, and ariſtocracy, was excluded from it, and if it was guided and ruled by turbulent and ambitious men, might eaſily overturn the preſent frame of the conſtitution; and that ſuch a Houſe of Commons, as your project of reformation offers to the nation, would not only be free from all influence of the crown, peerage, and ariſtocracy, but would be compoſed of the meaneſt and moſt intemperate members of ſociety, in deſperate circumſtances, ready (to uſe your colleague Tone's language) for any change, becauſe no change could make them worſe,

flagitious,

flagitious, ignorant, and bigoted, and therefore the tools ſpecially adapted to the execution of the daring projects of wicked and ambitious demagogues; they would conſider the higher claſſes of ſociety as their natural enemies, and endeavour to hunt the ariſtocracy from the country by every ſpecies of violence and outrage, and to found a democratic Romiſh republic, ſeparated from the Britiſh Empire, on the ruins of the monarchy, the peerage and the ariſtocracy in general. As to the change of the national religious eſtabliſhment, you have furniſhed convincing proofs, you have even been at great pains to demonſtrate, that it would give you no uneaſineſs, nay that it would meet your hearty approbation; to a modern philoſopher, a moſque, a pagodo, a Romiſh chapel, a diſſenting conventicle, and a Proteſtant church, are equally acceptable, as places of worſhip; the politician who derides all religion as prieſtcraft, will affect to be of that religion moſt palatable to the party he eſpouſes, or which eſpouſes him: and you have diſplayed ſuch ſymptoms of your attachment to republicaniſm on the French plan, that no reaſonable perſon can doubt your eaſy acquieſcence with ſuch a revolution in this kingdom, as has been effected in France; moſt people indeed conjecture, that you would not be long contented even with ſuch a form of government, unleſs you ſhould be elected one of the directory; nor indeed with any form of government, if the chief management of the public purſe, and public adminiſtration was withheld from your inſatiable avarice and ambition.

Excluſive of the radical wickedneſs of your ſcheme of reform, there are ſome abſurdities in it, which deſerve notice; not to aggravate its political and moral turpitude, that is impoſſible; but to expoſe the folly of the projector in ſome particulars, and to ſhew that folly and miſchief may be co-partners in the ſame houſe. The kingdom is, by your ſcheme, to be divided into departments, each department to contain five thouſand houſes; local population in this and in every other kingdom is of a fluctuating nature, cities, towns, villages, and large tracts of country, which were heretofore

very

very populous, are now but thinly inhabited; in England ſome towns, ſuch as Mancheſter, Liverpool, and Birmingham, have ſwelled in a few years to ten times their former bulk, their inhabitants encreaſing in that proportion; whilſt other ancient towns and cities, ſuch as Lincoln, have decreaſed; ſimilar has been the revolution reſpecting the inhabitants of large tracts of country, and the republican faction in England, whoſe *underſtrapper* you are here, and their and your great apoſtles, Paine, Price, and Prieſtley, found their arguments for a reform of the repreſentation of the people in England, on the inequality of it, ariſing from theſe changes in the ſtate of local population: and your arguments for a reform in Ireland, are founded in a great meaſure on the ſame principle. If ſuch changes in local population have taken place in England (a country for ages enjoying the ſweets of a regular government) in ſhort ſpaces of time, ſome of them within the memory of perſons now living; much greater changes of that nature are to be expected, and are in fact experienced, in Ireland, a country not yet two hundred years reclaimed, for the moſt part, from a ſtate of barbariſm, and during that ſpace of time twice in a great meaſure depopulated by inteſtine war. I can remember the city of Dublin, one-fourth leſs than it is at preſent; the village of the Black Rock near Dublin, fifty years ago, contained three houſes only, it now with its environs, contains five hundred, if not more. The town of Belfaſt, that hot-bed of ſedition, infamous for its turbulence even in the time of Cromwell, as may be ſeen in Milton's Works, has been nearly doubled in ſize within half a century; whilſt the ancient town of Carrickfergus has been diminiſhed in the ſame proportion: and the town of Belfaſt itſelf is now on the decline by the decay of its trade, owing to the reſtleſs diſpoſition of its factious inhabitants. Revolutionary principles do not foſter commerce —trade is nurſed in the cradle of peace and tranquillity—the changes in local population in Ireland conſtantly viſible, muſt require a conſtant variation in the limits of your propoſed departments, and at every election of repreſentatives, there

muſt be, to preſerve your equality of repreſentation, a new diviſion of the kingdom, into departments; the immenſe increaſe of the number of electors, from leſs than eighty thouſand, the preſent computed number, to ſeven hundred thouſand and upwards by your ſcheme, and theſe for the moſt part ſemibarbarians, would of itſelf cauſe very great, if not irremediable, confuſion in the elections of members of parliament. The undefineable limits of the departments for any length of time, would render ſuch elections utterly impracticable. The deſperate ruffian, who alone could propoſe himſelf as a candidate for a ſeat in parliament, for any department, with any probability of ſucceſs, could never know with certainty what ſet of electors to ſolicit for votes; previous to each general election, to preſerve equality of repreſentation, a new diviſion muſt be attempted: the election muſt immediately follow the diviſion, becauſe every day might cauſe a change in the local population: the ſhifting of the departments muſt be attended with inextricable confuſion; the party views of active demagogues, living in different departments, would create inſurmountable difficulties in every attempt of a new diviſion; the very nature of the propoſed diviſions would render them impracticable in many inſtances. Suppoſe one department to decreaſe, after the limits of it were firſt defined, from five thouſand houſes to half that number, or to increaſe in the ſame proportion, before a new election, or during any given period; and ſuppoſe the departments ſurrounding it on every ſide, had neither encreaſed or decreaſed, or in a much leſs proportion during that period, a caſe which would often happen, where the departments were partly compoſed of cities, towns, and populous villages; how would the limits of the encloſed increaſed or diminiſhed department be aſcertained on a new diviſion? If its population increaſed, its limits muſt decreaſe, and vice verſa, muſt the limits of all the adjacent ſurrounding departments, be puſhed in, and puſhed out, according to the nature of the change of the population of the encloſed department? and muſt a progreſſive convulſion of compreſſion or

dilation

dilation be circulated in a ring through all the departments of the ſtate, and all their inhabitants? The idea brings to my mind the ſoporific operation of the lecture in the Dunciad on the aſſembly of attendant dunces,

> So from the midmoſt the nutation ſpreads,
> Round and more round o'er all the ſea of heads.

In ſhort, the abſurdity of your ſcheme for procuring a permanent equality of repreſentation as to number of electors, is glaringly ridiculous; and as to its folly and impracticability can be only rivalled by the projects of the profeſſors in the Gulliverian academy of Lagado; and yet it fully and ſufficiently manifeſts the ſpirit of moſt dangerous innovation in the projector. Thus, ſir, I conclude my ſtrictures on your projected ſcheme of reform: truſting that I have diſſected your propoſed *felonious repreſentation* (to uſe a phraſe of your own in debate) as ſurgeons diſſect malefactors, as well for public inſtruction as public example.

The queſtion, whether any and what kind of reform in repreſentation is neceſſary, diſcuſſed.

And now, ſir, I ſhall conſider the queſtions, whether any reform is requiſite in the preſent mode of repreſentation of the people in parliament, from actual or ſuppoſed abuſes in it; and whether the exiſting laws of the land, with ſmall additions to them, do not afford full and adequate means for the correction of ſuch abuſes as may have crept into it. The preſent mode of county repreſentation, you have in your propoſed ſcheme of reform, allowed to require no amendment, as it is by your ſcheme to remain on its preſent footing; againſt the preſent borough repreſentation it is objected that the ſeats in parliament for many boroughs are ſold by neceſſitous and corrupt men, who have obtained a domineering intereſt over their fellow corporators; that others of them are under the patronage of great noblemen, or of powerful and rich commoners, who control and command the votes of the corporators ſo far, as to procure perſons of their nomination to be returned to parliament, as members for ſuch boroughs; and that both the ſale of, and nomination to, ſeats in parliament for ſuch boroughs, are procured, either from the faulty original conſtitu-

tion of them, communicating their corporate rights to a very ſmall number of perſons, in ſome caſes, to twelve burgeſſes only; or by the exertion of the intereſt of the aforeſaid patrons of theſe boroughs, in procuring ſuch perſons only to be admitted members of theſe corporations, as have engaged always to vote as they ſhall direct; and in excluding many perſons from admiſſion, who from the fair conſtruction of their foundation charters are entitled to be admitted members. It is alſo urged againſt borough repreſentation in general, that it confines the election of repreſentatives of the Commons in parliament to a very ſmall number of perſons, excluding the great maſs of the people from the privilege of voting for members of parliament. I ſhall conſider theſe objections ſeriatim. As to the firſt, the ſale of ſeats in parliament for boroughs, I admit it is an abuſe, but it is not an abuſe of any great magnitude. I have carefully examined the ſtate of the borough repreſentation in the laſt parliament, and have found that the members who were generally reputed to have purchaſed ſeats in it, did not amount to more than thirty, if to ſo many. A great proportion of which were barriſters, ſo that the purchaſing members did not amount to above a tenth part of the Houſe. Many boroughs, reputed venal, returned a purchaſer for one ſeat only, the other ſeat being filled by the patron, or by one of his immediate dependants. And of all the ſubjects of this kingdom you, ſir, have the leaſt reaſon to complain of ſuch venal repreſentation. Every member of the laſt parliament, who exerciſed his oratorical talents under your auſpices, ſat in the Houſe, as repreſentative for a borough moſt notoriouſly venal, three gentlemen excepted, and two of theſe ſat as repreſentatives of boroughs under the influence of patrons; and the third, for a corporate town; they were all barriſters. The ill ſucceſs of ſome of your adherents in the trade of parliament, and their inability or diſinclination to repurchaſe, owing to their ill ſucceſs, you have pathetically lamented in your addreſs, as I have already noted. The exiſting laws, if properly enforced, afford ſome remedy of this venality of ſeats in parliament; and

Objections againſt the preſent ſtate of borough repreſentation conſidered.

if

if they do not afford a complete one, it is very eaſy to deviſe laws, whoſe operation would prevent, or detect and puniſh, ſuch corruption. Teſts, abjuring all corrupt means of obtaining ſeats, may be impoſed on all members on their taking their ſeats. The penalties of perjury, excluſion from, and perpetual diſability to ſit, in parliament; and deprivation of, and perpetual excluſion from, all corporate privileges, may be inflicted on the corruptor when detected, and ſpecial means of detection of all ſuch corrupt bargains may be preſcribed. When venality is detected, the corporators guilty of aiding, or abetting, the corruption, may be disfranchiſed, and otherwiſe heavily puniſhed, and proviſion made, for transferring and extending the franchiſes of the corporation to other perſons, and to greater numbers, by the grant of a new charter, or by ſpecial authority of parliament. Such wholeſome regulations will prevent the abuſe of the franchiſes of boroughs by the ſale of ſeats in parliament, without altering or ſubverting the preſent frame of the conſtitution. Greedy adventurers in the trade of parliament will by ſuch means be for ever excluded; and muſt betake themſelves to honeſter employments; and I do not know any one perſon in the kingdom, ſuch laws will operate againſt, with ſo much effect, as againſt yourſelf; when they ſhall be enacted, you muſt ſhut up your ſhop, cloſe your books, abandon your hitherto moſt lucrative trade, and live on your ill-gotten acquiſitions. You have ſufficient penetration to diſcover, that the enacting ſuch laws would operate to your own diſadvantage; and therefore, though you declaim againſt the abuſe of venality in borough repreſentation, you mean only to deceive and inflame the vulgar by ſuch declamations: You do not intend correction or improvement. Your aim is utter ſubverſion, not reformation of the conſtitution, and your project manifeſts it. So far as ſuch corrective and preventive laws may be ſaid to be a reform in parliament, I admit the expediency of ſuch reform. But what reaſonable argument can you ground on ſo partial an abuſe eaſily curable by the application of proper remedies, for the annihilation of the

whole

whole borough repreſentation, of all the corporations in the kingdom, cities, towns, and boroughs ſending repreſentatives to parliament? Is the whole repreſentative body to ſuffer political death, becauſe a limb of it is affected by a diſeaſe eaſily curable? what opinion would be entertained of the mental ſanity of a ſurgeon, who, becauſe a man's arm was ſlightly bruiſed, would preſcribe the ſhooting him through the head as an effectual cure? or of an architect, who ſhould propoſe to demoliſh the whole building to repair a flaw in the parapet? It is almoſt impoſſible to give ſuch ſort of arguments any ſerious anſwer. As to the ſecond objection againſt borough repreſentation, ariſing from the patronage of boroughs veſted in noblemen and commoners of great property, and chiefly acquired by them by the ſituation of their eſtates, lying within, or adjacent to, the precincts of boroughs, it cannot be ſupported on the ground of venality. Such noblemen and commoners receive no pecuniary advantage from ſuch patronage; on the contrary, the ſupport of their intereſt in theſe patronized corporations, is attended by conſiderable trouble and expence; and they recommend to the ſeats in parliament, men ſtrongly connected with themſelves, and under their influence. You ſtate, ſir, in your addreſs, that the patronage of a borough is ſometimes ſold to a rich nobleman or commoner for the ſum of ſixteen thouſand pounds, which, if true, ſhews, that no perſon except ſuch as poſſeſs very large properties, can obtain or retain the patronage of ſuch a borough. The annual legal intereſt of ſixteen thouſand pounds amounts to nine hundred and ſixty pounds, and to this muſt be added the coſt of maintaining the intereſt in the borough, which muſt annually amount to a conſiderable ſum; hence the retaining the patronage of ſuch a borough, muſt ſtand the patron in the annual expence of above one thouſand pounds, an expence which octennial and other contingent ſales of the ſeats would never defray: conſequently, if views of advantage from the ſale of the ſeats, were the inducements to the purchaſe, the purchaſers muſt be idiots indeed! but as I have

above

above ſtated, the ſeats for theſe boroughs are never ſold; and reſpecting ſuch boroughs, no reform is neceſſary. The true ſource of *actual* parliamentary repreſentation is property; the Houſe of Commons judges and decides on the ſums neceſſary to be levied on the ſubject for defraying the expences of the ſtate, they will not ſuffer the leaſt alteration of their deciſions on that ſubject to be made by the other branches of the legiſlature. The neceſſity, the quantum, and the expenditure of the public ſupplies, are under their peculiar cognizance and juriſdiction. This ſuperintendence has beſtowed on that Houſe all the reſt of its powers and privileges, which it has gradually acquired ſince its firſt formation in the reign of Henry the third: It is therefore highly conſiſtent with the original principles of our conſtitution, that the members of ſociety who have moſt property, ſhould have moſt influence in the Houſe of Commons: They who contribute moſt largely to the public expence ſhould have moſt intereſt in that Houſe which raiſed the funds for defraying it, and directs the expenditure. The nobleman or commoner whoſe property amounts to ten thouſand pounds yearly, ſhould have a greater ſway in the Houſe of Commons, than the poor perſon, whoſe property amounts perhaps only to the value of the garments which cover him; becauſe the one contributes largely to the expences of the ſtate, the other little or nothing. The rich nobleman, though he is taxed by the Houſe of Commons in proportion to his property, yet cannot himſelf ſit in it, he is therefore entitled to influence in that aſſembly, which he can no otherwiſe poſſeſs than by ſubſtitution; moſt of what I have here urged will apply to the rich commoner, patron of a borough; the principle, on which his claim to influence in the Houſe of Commons reſts, is the ſame; he indeed may ſit in that Houſe, and generally does, for one of the ſeats of his patronized borough, a privilege which the nobleman does not enjoy; but the magnitude of his property entitles the commoner to more intereſt there than one ſeat can confer upon him. The great ſtakes of both the rich

nobleman

nobleman and commoner in the ſtate generally ſecure their attachment to it; and engage both themſelves and their adherents to ſupport the real intereſts of their country; becauſe by ſo doing they ſupport their own. And this mixture of ariſtocratic influence with the democratic part of our conſtitution, is admirably adapted to the correction of exceſſes and of errors incident to both, and harmonizes that unrivalled conſtitution. You do not, ſir, urge the objections againſt that part of our parliamentary repreſentation, which proceeds from ſuch patronized boroughs, as are not venal, with a good grace; you never would have ſat in parliament, if ſuch repreſentation had not exiſtence in our conſtitution; neither your family, fortune, or acquirements could give you any rational hope of ſuch a diſtinction. Until the laſt parliament, when the citizens of Dublin were ſo far deceived by your preceding conduct, as to return you one of their repreſentatives, you never had a ſeat in the Houſe of Commons, except for a patronized borough, and whilſt you ſat in parliament, as the ſubſtitute of a nobleman, by whoſe intereſt you were returned, we never heard of your preſent deſperate project of pretended reform, nor what you now ſtile emancipation; the ſupport of the proteſtant *aſcendancy*, a term coined by you, was then your cant; your patron, if you had then diſcloſed your malignant deſigns againſt the church and ſtate, might have diſcarded you. Yet notwithſtanding your original admiſſion into the Houſe of Commons as repreſentative for a patronized borough, which I ſhall always conſider a public misfortune, I muſt at the ſame time avow my approbation of that mode of repreſentation in a qualified degree, as well for the reaſons I have given, as becauſe I have known ſome of the greateſt ornaments of their country, and men who have done the moſt ſignal ſervices to it, introduced into that Houſe by ſuch means.

The objection, that many perſons well intitled to the freedom of corporations, are notwithſtanding excluded by electioneering intrigue, is fully anſwered by ſtating, that they have

their

their legal remedies for ſuch injuſtice by writs of mandamus, and all abuſes in corporations except the venality above mentioned, and that too in ſome degree, is remediable by the due courſe of the exiſting laws of the land, by writs of quo warranto, and informations in the nature of quo warranto, and require not any new ſpecies of reform whatſoever; the exiſting laws duly exerted, and which it is in the power of all injured parties conſtantly to reſort to, and to demand their effectual exertion, ſecuring the pure and undefiled exerciſe of the rights conferred on a borough at its original creation.

It is objected, that the original conſtitution of ſome boroughs is vicious, in conferring the whole privilege of electing repreſentatives in parliament on a ſovereign and twelve burgeſſes; it is to be remarked, that very few boroughs in this kingdom are ſo conſtituted, the charters of an infinite majority of the corporations in this kingdom, confer the privilege of voting for repreſentatives in parliament, on the ſovereigns, burgeſſes, and freemen at large; and with reſpect to ſuch as are ſo conſtituted, it may be urged, that the inveſting the principal inhabitants of ſome boroughs with the privilege of electing repreſentatives in parliament for ſuch boroughs excluſively, was by no means an unreaſonable exertion of the prerogative of the crown, but is well warranted by that principle of the conſtitution, which directs, that the repreſentation of the people in parliament ſhould be regulated, not by numbers, but by property and reſpectability; and the principal inhabitants or landholders in ſuch boroughs are *actually* repreſented in parliament, the others *virtually*, and ſuch conſtitution may be peculiarly adapted to the circumſtances of ſome boroughs. The excluſion of the great maſs of the people from interfering in the election of repreſentatives in parliament, or from the elective franchiſe, by the preſent ſtate of borough repreſentation, I conſider as the bulwark, and not as a weak and faulty part, of our conſtitution. From the firſt dawn of the Engliſh conſtitution to the preſent day, the members enjoying the elective franchiſes in England never amounted

amounted to one-ſixtieth part of the people. The caſe has been the ſame in Ireland ſince the communication of the Engliſh conſtitution to this country, and it muſt always continue ſo, whilſt the *actual* repreſentation of property and reſpectability, and *virtual* repreſentation of numbers, continue to be principles of the conſtitution. In Britain, a country whoſe inhabitants are moſtly of the ſame religious perſuaſion, which has been long ſubject to a regular ſyſtem of laws, a due adminiſtration of juſtice, and where the laws meet with due reverence and ſubmiſſion, a dilation of the elective franchiſe, in ſome moderate degree, perhaps might not be attended with any deſtructive convulſion; the ſituation of this country is the very reverſe of that of Britain in all the above particulars; and if projects or reform are rejected in Britain, as tending to anarchy and revolution, there are reaſons for rejecting them here a thouſand fold ſtronger than the reaſons which have decided their rejection in the ſiſter country; and how very ridiculous is your argument, or rather declamation, againſt the preſent parliamentary conſtitution of Ireland, *calling it a borough parliament, and ſtating that it was adequate to the management of Ireland whilſt it continued a province, but abſurd and inapplicable when that province became a nation!* Ireland though a kingdom with an independent legiſlature, is ſtill, and I hope ever will be, a province of the Britiſh empire; and its parliamentary conſtitution is the very ſame with that of Great Britain. The boroughs in England are as numerous in proportion as the boroughs in Ireland, nor are they a whit more independent, more chaſte, or more incorrupt; if Ireland has a borough parliament, ſo has Great Britain; the latter is a nation, at leaſt in as large a ſenſe of the word, as the former, that parliament has been found adequate to the management of Great Britain, and a ſimilar parliament has been found, and I truſt ever will be found, adequate to the management of Ireland, whether it be a province, a nation, or both; and both it may be, and is. I truſt I have already ſhewn, that your project of pretended reform, built on the

principle

principle of extending actual repreſentation to the maſs of the people, that is, of regulating it by numbers, not by property, teems with deſtruction, ſubverſion, and rebellion; that like Pandora's box, it is a compoſition of all the plagues with which the human race was ever afflicted; and conſequently that it is the true intereſt of every lover of his country, of all the inhabitants of Ireland, whether Proteſtants of the eſtabliſhed church, Diſſenters, or Romaniſts, (notwithſtanding your deceptious ſeductive arts to inliſt the latter claſs under your political ſtandard) to join as one man in ſupport of the preſent conſtitution of their country, and in maintaining the preſent mode of parliamentary repreſentation, as they tender the preſervation of themſelves, their properties, their wives, their children and the future welfare of their poſterity in general; that they ought to conſider, that all the claſſes of people in a ſtate, form but the one ſtate, and that the lower and poorer claſſes, though excluded from the elective franchiſe, yet are repreſented in parliament by members elected by the richer and more reſpectable claſſes; inaſmuch as ſuch members are repreſentatives of the inhabitants of the whole ſtate, which during the exiſtence of a regular government is one and indiviſible, and not barely, of the perſons who elect them, who are but part of the ſtate: that the lower poorer claſſes, not participating of the elective franchiſe, are nevertheleſs, *virtually* repreſented, the richer and more reſpectable claſſes, enjoying the elective franchiſe *actually:* and that *virtual* repreſentation confers as much benefit on the repreſented, as *actual*; becauſe the repreſentatives are bound to conſult and guard the intereſts of the whole community equally; that ſuch has been, and from the nature of things muſt be, the principles and practice of every repreſentative government on earth: and that the extenſion of the elective franchiſe to the maſs of the people indiſcriminately, would render all repreſentative government impracticable, and would bury civil liberty under its cumbrous ruins. In ſhort, a wiſe people will always conſider avaricious, greedy, importunate, inſatiable, projecting, ambitious

bitious, demagogues, clamorous mendicant orators, and ſham patriots, as the moſt deſtructive, deteſtable *peſts* of civil ſociety.

Having thus, ſir, ſhewn what amendments and corrections our preſent ſyſtem of parliamentary repreſentation may ſtand in need of, and how they are to be elected; and having ſhewn, that the abuſes which time may have introduced into that ſyſtem, are very eaſily remediable; that the correction and prevention of ſuch abuſes are not what you call reform, that ſuch reform is not only inexpedient, but ruinous; and that no general reform is neceſſary; and having in a preceding part of my anſwer, expoſed the deſtructive and fraudulent tendency of the firſt part of your reform which you call emancipation, and that your projected reform of the repreſentation of the people in parliament *would not give a conſtitution to the people, nor Catholic emancipation a people to the conſtitution*, as you quaintly and dogmatically expreſs yourſelf; I ſhall proceed to conſider your alleged grievance of the influence of the Engliſh cabinet in Ireland, which influence you call a *foreign yoke, the legiſlative uſurpation of a humiliated and a tame tyrant!* I am glad, ſir, that you admit the Engliſh cabinet to be a humiliated and *tame* tyrant, that is, if I underſtand you right, a tyrant deprived of power, and conſcious of its impotence, and if this foreign cabinet is deprived of power, and conſcious of its impotence, it cannot retain a galling influence in Ireland, the influence of ſuch a reduced tyrant muſt ariſe either from the folly of thoſe who ſubmit to its dictates, or from their conſciouſneſs of the wiſdom of its counſels, and the ſalutary effects of its meaſures; if its influence were pernicious and deſtructive, even the folly of thoſe who had for a time ſubmitted to it could not inſure its duration, its exiſtence muſt be tranſitory, as it would be only during pleaſure, and even idiots cannot be long pleaſed with that which is deſtructive and painful; but if its influence ariſes from the propriety, the juſtice, the wiſdom, and beneficence, of its meaſures, its duration might be protracted, and if ſuch be the nature

of

of the influence of the Engliſh cabinet in Ireland, I hope it will long continue. But firſt, ſir, I muſt explain your preciſe meaning of the words, *Influence of the Engliſh cabinet, and its legiſlative uſurpation in Ireland*; it is this, that the meaſures propoſed to the Iriſh parliament for adoption by the lord lieutenant of Ireland and his chief ſecretary, (always Engliſhmen appointed by his majeſty with the advice of his cabinet counſel in England) are, previous to their being propoſed here, deviſed and digeſted by his majeſty, and his cabinet council in England, and that the influence of the ſervants of the crown in the parliament of Ireland is ſo great, that ſuch meaſures are generally adopted here. Your complaints on this head, ſir, amount to this; that it is a public grievance that his majeſty ſhould interfere in the government of his kingdom of Ireland, part of his empire, inſeparably annexed to his imperial crown of Great Britain; it is the duty of the king, by his miniſters, to propoſe for the adoption of parliament ſuch meaſures, as he with the advice of his cabinet council ſhall deem neceſſary or conducive to the ſafety and proſperity of his empire: he has by the conſtitution an undoubted right to deliberate on thoſe meaſures; he is reſident in England, and is it reaſonable to ſuppoſe that he will approve of ſuch meaſures as may be recommended by his ſervants in this kingdom, as proper to be propoſed for the adoption of his parliament of Ireland, a kingdom inſeparably annexed to and dependant upon his imperial crown of Great Britain, without conſulting with his cabinet council in England, on the propriety of ſuch meaſures, and in their tendency to promote the general welfare of the whole empire? any perſon who maintains the doctrine, that the Britiſh cabinet council ought not to interfere with their advice to our common ſovereign on ſuch meaſures, is an enemy to the connexion of the two countries, and to the unity of the empire; the Engliſh cabinet council giving their advice to his majeſty on Iriſh meaſures, are ſo far an Iriſh cabinet council, and to cut off all interference of the Engliſh cabinet council in adviſing his Majeſty, with reſpect

to

to Iriſh meaſures, is in effect to cut off all interference of his Majeſty in the government of his kingdom of Ireland; becauſe he is reſident in England, and cannot conſtitutionally act in meaſures which regard his kingdom of Ireland without conſulting the Cabinet Council in England, as ſuch meaſures ought not to operate excluſively for the benefit, either of Ireland or Great Britain, but for the benefit of the Empire in general, and no one meaſure of government can operate for the benefit or detriment of Ireland, which does not operate for the benefit or detriment of Great Britain, when the intereſts of both countries are rightly underſtood: If his Majeſty, aſſiſted by the advice of his Cabinet Council in England is not to interfere with the government of his kingdom of Ireland, he muſt approve all meaſures, tranſmitted to him by his cabinet council in Ireland, or reject them, without conſulting with the miniſters in England, with whom he conſults on all buſineſs of the Empire, and without hearing them debated, or in any manner exerciſing his own judgment upon them, and this would in fact compleatly ſeparate the two countries to the ruin of Ireland, whoſe welfare, as I have already ſhewn, depends on her connexion with Britain; he might remain nominally King of Ireland, but he would be only nominally ſo; the very appointment of his lieutenant in Ireland, now appointed with the advice of his cabinet council in England, would be torn from him by the doctrine, that the Engliſh cabinet ought not to interfere with the affairs of Ireland; the meaſures reſpecting Ireland recommended by the Engliſh cabinet, through the medium of the Lord Lieutenant and his Secretary, to the Iriſh Parliament, are generally firſt deviſed and digeſted by the cabinet council in Ireland, and thence tranſmitted to England, for the approbation of his Majeſty: And I do not find that ſuch meaſures receive any greater countenance or patronage from the parliament of Ireland, than the meaſures of government in Great Britain receive from the parliament of that country; ſuch meaſures are freely debated, varied, approved, or rejected, in both parliaments. And the cabinet

binet council of England, or rather his Majeſty, (for it is his Majeſty's lawful influence with his Iriſh parliament you really mean, when you talk of the influence of the Engliſh cabinet in Ireland, and it is the lawful exertion of his Majeſty's prerogative as ſovereign of this realm you mean to exclude) has no more influence in the Iriſh parliament, than in the Britiſh. To ſhew it is his Majeſty's lawful authority you mean to aboliſh in this kingdom, when you talk of extinguiſhing the influence of the Engliſh cabinet, it is to be obſerved, that his Majeſty never exerciſes his kingly office in the general affairs of government, and particularly in deviſing political meaſures to be propoſed to his parliament for their approbation, without firſt adviſing with his cabinet council; and you ſtate preciſely, *that the unconſtitutional influence of the crown, and what you falſely ſtile, the proſcription of the Catholics*, are the fundamental cauſes of the diſcontent and jealouſy of Ireland; now what you here ſtile the influence of the crown, you in other parts of your addreſs ſtile the influence of the Britiſh cabinet in the parliament of Ireland: and in truth throughout the whole addreſs, the moſt abuſive effuſion of malice I have ever read! you make uſe of the words *Miniſters of the Crown* and *Britiſh Cabinet*, to ſignify the Crown and the King himſelf, by way of a little quibbling defence againſt legal proſecution. Whenever you mention any of our deceaſed Monarchs, the abuſe of whom is not by law puniſhable, you call them, as well as their Miniſters in plain terms, murderers, robbers, and cheats; it would be as yet, you well know, ſomewhat dangerous to apply the ſame opprobrious Billingſgate language to the reigning Monarch. What you ſtile unconſtitutional influence of the crown, or of the Britiſh cabinet in Parliament, is nothing more or leſs, than the influence in parliament which the laws give to the reigning Monarch, and without which he would be no ſovereign whatſoever; in ſhort, you mean his prerogative, as conferred and defined by the laws of the land, which is his conſtitutional influence, and the depriving him of which would in fact be his depoſition.

The

The reform you propoſed and whoſe conſtitution you in ſome meaſure explain in the Litany with which you conclude your addreſs, would baniſh from the Houſe of Commons, all kingly and ariſtocratic influence, and would render all Monarchical government impracticable; it would in fact extinguiſh the Monarchy, and ſubſtitute in its place a democratic republic, and all your rant of bombaſtic figurative nonſenſe, calculated to blind the intellectual viſion (to uſe your own phraſe) of your readers by the duſt of the rubbiſh, "*ſuch as* "*ſelf-legiſlation, baptizing the Houſe of Hanover with royalty,* "*the people being ſponſors for their allegiance to the liberty of the* "*ſubjects. Kings are but ſatellites, your freedom is the luminary* "*that has called them to the ſkies,*" and above all that concluſive effort of your ſublime and poetic genius, for which you certainly merit rank amongſt authors, the quotations from whoſe works illuſtrate the precepts contained in the *art of ſinking in poetry*, in which you ſo happily blend the ideas of the ſpindle, the diſtaff, and the ſchool-boy's top, with that of the revolution of the planets round the ſun from the principle of attraction, in the following elegant effuſion! "*Re-* "*form is a principle of attraction about which the King and peo-* "*ple would ſpin on quietly and inſenſibly in regular movements,* "*and in a ſyſtem common to them both*;" all this rant I ſay, is thundered forth pell mell on the reader, with a view the more effectually to conceal the hideous aſpect of your gorgon project, and to prevent and obviate the terrors and deteſtation it would create in the minds of all people, if it were ſeen in all its native horrible deformity!

Having, ſir, thus examined and expoſed the nature of your pretended grievances and propoſed remedies, I ſhall proceed to the epitome of your principles as ſet forth in this addreſs. You ſtate that the Miniſter of the Crown has endeavoured "to *render the King in Parliament every thing and* "*the people nothing*, that ſuch attempt renders him, the Mi-"niſter, more a traitor to the conſtitution, than the people "would be to the King, if they ſhould advance in arms and "place their leader on the Throne, becauſe in them it would

"be

" be only rebellion againſt their creature, the King, but in " the *other* it would be rebellion againſt *his Creator* the peo- " ple," by the word *other* here you do not point out the Miniſter, but the King : Becauſe by the word *other* you mean the perſon created by the people, that is, as you ſtate it, the King. There is indeed a ſort of juggling confuſion in the whole paragraph, which demonſtrates, that when you uſe the word Miniſter of the Crown, you really mean the King ; and that you frequently reſort to this ſpecies of quibbling from the cautionary motives already mentioned.

From this paragraph it appears, you deny that the King and his Parliament conjointly compoſe the ſupreme power of the ſtate : that is, the King, Lords and Commons acting in a body ; but that there is a power infinitely above them veſted in the people at large : and although the people compoſe one eſtate of the Parliament, by their repreſentatives duly elected, yet that the maſs of the people ſtill remains the ſupreme power in the ſtate, (as there muſt be ſome ſupreme power in every ſtate) and are not bound by the ordinances to which they conſent by their delegates. This is a novel doctrine unknown to the Britiſh Conſtitution, extracted from the modern French Code of Juriſprudence. By the Britiſh Conſtitution, the King in Parliament, that is, acting in conjunction with his Parliament, acts in conjunction with his people, and therefore to aſſert, that the King in Parliament can be every thing, and the people nothing, would be a blunder, if you did not mean to aſſert, that the maſs of the people, though repreſented in parliament, yet remain the ſupreme power of the ſtate. A ſecond novel principle, avowed in this paragraph is, that no act whatever committed by the people againſt the king, can amount to rebellion, even though they ſhould advance in arms, and place their leader on the throne, becauſe as you ſtate, the people is the *creator*, the king the *creature*, and the *creator* can never commit rebellion againſt his *creature :* It follows alſo as a corollary from this doctrine, that the people, the *creator*, may at their pleaſure annihilate their *crea-*

ture, the king, becauſe from the very nature of *creation*, the *creature* has no right to a longer exiſtence, than it ſhall pleaſe its *creator* to limit, who may at any time juſtly put an end to that exiſtence. A third novel doctrine contained in this paragraph is, that every attempt of the king and parliament to ſecure, or to exerciſe, a ſupreme authority in the ſtate, is in the king a wicked rebellion againſt his creator, the people, for which he, and the parliament his abettors in ſuch attempt, deſerve the puniſhment of rebellion, that is, death and confiſcation: and that the people inflicting ſuch penalties on him and his abettors, are acting juſtly and conſtitutionally. This principle too is extracted from the French code. The French philoſophers dethroned and beheaded their king, becauſe a few of his adherents preſumed to defend him from aſſaſſination in his own palace, by the mob, that is the people, and he and they therefore, according to the new French code, committed rebellion againſt their ſovereign, the people, and were juſtly condemned to death: A fourth novel doctrine advanced by you, is that ſuch attempt in king and parliament would be a wickeder act of rebellion in Ireland, more a rebellion in equity (*abſurd combination!*) than in any other country, becauſe, as you expreſsly ſtate, ſuch attempt "*would be the introduction not only* "*of a deſpotic, but a foreign yoke,*" and in another part you *ſtate the king to be an abſentee:* that is, though Great Britain and Ireland form but one empire, and though the king reſides within that empire, yet as he does not reſide in Ireland, he is a foreigner and an abſentee, and Great Britain, as to Ireland is *a foreign* country. How much you intend to encourage loyalty in Ireland, and to foſter the connexion between the two countries, by inculcating ſuch doctrines, I ſhall leave to the public to judge, and they no doubt will do juſtice to your ſentiments; notwithſtanding the impudent, hypocritical, and fraudulent ejaculations of qualified attachment to kingly power, and to that connexion, contained in the ſpecies of litany with which you cloſe your addreſs. You have officiouſly, zealouſly, and emphatically juſtified

the

the inhuman Iriſh maſſacre of all the Proteſtants in this kingdom, which the popiſh rebels of 1641 could lay their hands upon, men, women, and children, as I have already ſhewn: you not only juſtify the preſent horrible aſſaſſinations and robberies, nightly committed throughout many parts of this kingdom, *by popular and energetic Romaniſts, United Iriſhmen*, but you applaud them—expreſſing yourſelf thus, as I have already noticed concerning them, they are the effects of "*the ſpirit of political reformation*," and even in theſe caſes where charged to be carried to "*confiſcation, it is evi-*" *dent from the charge itſelf, that confiſcation looks to political* " *vengeance, not private plunder, it is a public cauſe, and let no* " *man perſuade you that it is not the cauſe of liberty on one ſide,* " *and tyranny on the other.*" *Confiſcation* means the ſeizing of the goods and property of felons and traitors, and ſecuring them for the uſe of the public. Attend, ye citizens of Dublin! Mr. Henry Grattan, who once ſat in parliament as one of your repreſentatives, publiſhes an addreſs to you, in which with moſt unparalleled impudence, he juſtifies and applauds the nightly aſſaſſinations and robberies of the United Iriſhmen! Theſe murderers and robbers, whoſe atrocities make the very blood of every honeſt man in the kingdom run cold at the recital, he tells you, are all glorious patriots acting in the cauſe of liberty againſt tyranny! their robberies, he calls *confiſcations*, that is, the lawful ſeizure of the property of traitors to be applied to the public uſe! According to him all your friends and relations ſlaughtered in their beds at night, have been juſtly put to death as traitors to the public cauſe of liberty, and their property has been juſtly ſeized by the murderers, to be applied to the ſupport of the army of United Iriſhmen! The horrible maſſacre of your anceſtors, according to him, was alſo juſt exertion of public ſpirit in a ſimilar glorious cauſe of liberty! Such, ſir, are the contents of your addreſs to your former conſtituents, an addreſs I will venture to affirm, never yet ſurpaſſed, nay I may ſay equalled, in arrogance, impudence, falſehood, miſrepreſentation, rancour, and wickedneſs, by any publication, which ever made its appearance, and eſcaped with impunity, in any civilized country

country under the Sun; you know, sir, I have neither misquoted nor misrepresented you, and I recommend you very heartily to the patronage and protection of your masters, the Jacobins in Great Britain, and of their brethren in France and Ireland; they never yet met, and never will meet with any human creature more deserving of the countenance and protection of such a respectable society.

I shall now, sir, conclude my answer, by a sort of litany, as you conclude your address, first observing, that your last ejaculation—"However it may please the Almighty to dispose of *princes*, and *of parliaments*—may the liberties of "the *people* be *immortal*," openly teaches that a limited monarchy, a government founded on the joint powers of a king, lords, and representatives of the people, is not the best or only mode of securing the liberty of the subjects, that such liberty may not only subsist, but may be of so permanent a nature, as to be immortal under a government withouttking or parliament, that is under a *Jacobin Democratic Republic*, with a fervent prayer for the establishment of which government, you conclude your address, and a very proper and consistent conclusion it is!

Now for my litany:

May the present constitution of the British Empire be immortal; and may the king always enjoy that influence in both houses of parliament, with which the constitution has invested him, and which is indispensably necessary for the good government of the Empire!

May the parliamentary constitution be immortal; and may it always be an operative part of the constitution, confining the kingly power within constitutional limits only; and may it never be able or inclined to encroach on the constitutional authority of the crown, but may that authority, be for ever able to maintain its own constitutional rights!

May the House of Commons flourish; may it ever be elected by the opulent and most respectable part of the people only; and may the whole community, and the common interest of the whole Empire, be the only objects of its care!

May

May the connexion between Great Britain and Ireland be immortal; may the Britiſh Empire be one and indiviſible; and may the traitorous attempts, of all greedy, clamorous, ſturdy beggars, mendicant orators, ſham patriots, deſperate projectors, French agents, and ſpies, and Jacobin incendiaries, to ſeparate this nation from the Britiſh Empire, be abortive!

May all ſuch traitors abjure the realm and depart (to uſe the phraſe of Mr. Henry Grattan,) "*riding on the waves of the Atlantic*;" or may they meet the fate of Macheath's gang in the opera, and be all either *hanged or tranſported!*

May the Proteſtant religion, as now eſtabliſhed by law, continue to be the eſtabliſhed religion of the ſtate, and the Proteſtant aſcendancy in church and ſtate be immortal; may all its profeſſors be inſpired with true chriſtian courage, piety, and charity; and may all diſſenters from that chriſtian communion, of whatſoever denomination, be reconciled and converted to it; and until it ſhall pleaſe the Almighty, ſo to illuminate their underſtandings, as to work ſuch a change in their opinions, may they enjoy perfect civil freedom in the fulleſt and faireſt ſenſe; but may all ſuch of them as erroneouſly maintain doctrines ſubverſive of the laws and conſtitution of the ſtate, as points of faith, be excluded from all functions, offices and employments in the ſtate, which would furniſh them with opportunity and power to ſubvert, or to attempt to ſubvert, the conſtitution of the Empire! May the perfect civil freedom of the ſubject, never be artfully confounded with the enjoyment, or capability of enjoyment, of the political power of the ſtate; and may excluſion from ſuch functions, offices and enployments, of all members of any ſect of chriſtians, which maintain as points of faith, doctrines ſubverſive of the laws and conſtitution of the ſtate, continue, as long as they ſhall perſiſt in profeſſing and maintaining ſuch doctrines!

PATRICK DUIGENAN.

Henrietta-Street, Dublin,
Jan. 20th, 1798.

APPENDIX.

CONTAINING,

I. THE ADDRESS of the ROMAN CATHOLICS of DUBLIN, presented to MR. GRATTAN at their Meeting in FRANCIS-STREET, *February* 27, 1795, with his Answer.

II. MR. GRATTAN'S ADDRESS to his FELLOW CITIZENS of DUBLIN, on the Dissolution of the Parliament, in *July* 1797.

III. MR. GRATTAN'S EPISTLE to DR. DUIGENAN, *August* 7, 1798.

IV. EXTRACT from the REPORT of the SECRET COMMITTEE of the HOUSE OF LORDS, *August* 3, 1798.

THE

ADDRESS

OF THE

CATHOLICS OF DUBLIN, &c.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

HENRY GRATTAN.

SIR,

WE are inſtructed by the Catholics of Dublin, to offer you their humble tribute of thanks and gratitude, as well for the eminent ſervices which you have rendered to this Kingdom, on various occaſions, as for your able and generous exertions in their cauſe. It is not eaſy to do juſtice to the merits of a man, whoſe name is connected with the moſt brilliant events of his time; and who has already obtained the higheſt of all titles—THE DELIVERER OF HIS COUNTRY; but though it is impoſſible to add to your fame, by any terms we can employ, it muſt be grateful to you to learn, that you have a place, not only in the admiration, but in the affections of your countrymen.

To be thus loved and admired, is ſurely an enviable diſtinction. It may not, perhaps, be ſufficient to preſerve or purchaſe ſtation and power, at Court; but to a well-formed mind it is a ſource of purer ſatisfaction, than the favour and protection even of Monarchs or their Miniſters.

Few men have had it in their power to do ſo much for their native land, as you have done for Ireland. When you firſt

entered into public life, garriſon habits, and provincial prejudices, were oppoſed to Iriſh intereſts and feelings; and what was ſtill more diſcouraging, the different deſcriptions of people in this country, far from being ready to meet in a common point for their mutual advantage, were kept aſunder by perverſe and unintelligible antipathies of a religious nature. Into this chaos of contradictions, you infuſed your ſpirit, and brought order, in ſome meaſure, out of confuſion.

The firſt effort of your eloquence was to rouſe the Iriſh Parliament, to aſſert its own independence; and notwithſtanding the habits of ſubjection which particular cauſes had induced, you were ſucceſsful.

At preſent you are engaged in a purſuit, equally honourable to your head, and ſtill more to your heart. As Mover of the Catholic Bill, you are endeavouring to inculcate the neceſſity of moderation and juſtice, where you before inſpired courage; and urging men who triumphed over foreign ſupremacy, to an act of much greater dignity and difficulty, a ſacrifice of the prejudices of their youth and education.

In this work, ſo full of genius and public ſpirit, and which goes to the creation of a people, as your former exertions went to the forming of a Conſtitution, you have already made conſiderable progreſs; and when you and your illuſtrious friends were called to the councils of a virtuous Viceroy, we looked with confidence to the accompliſhment of your patriotic intentions.

Some enemy, however, to the King and to the People, has interpoſed his malignant and wicked ſuggeſtions, and endeavoured to throw obſtacles in the way of our total emancipation. But we are far from giving way to ſentiments of deſpondency and alarm. We feel the juſtice of our pretenſions, and we are perſuaded that what is juſt will prevail over the arts of perfidy and falſehood.

What gives us the moſt ſenſible ſatisfaction is, the general union of ſentiment that pervades all ranks and deſcription of Iriſhmen

Iriſhmen on the preſent occaſion. Never before did Ireland ſpeak with a voice ſo unanimous.—Proteſtants and Catholics are at this moment united, and ſeem to have no other conteſt but who ſhall reſent moſt the outrage that has been offered to Iriſh pride, in the intended removal of a patriotic Viceroy from the Government—and you and your friends from the councils of this Kingdom.

For our own part, it ſhall be our ſtudy to cultivate an union ſo happily begun. We have no ſelfiſh or narrow views. We do not wiſh to acquire privileges for ourſelves in order to abridge the privileges of others; for we know that in matters of Liberty and Conſtitution, to give is to gain.

With regard to the men who may have the hardihood to take the ſituations which you and your friends are about to lay down, if, unfortunately for this country, ſuch an event ſhould happen, we ſhall only ſay that we do not envy them the ſenſations which they muſt take up at the ſame time. That man's temper muſt be of ſteel, who can hold up his head amidſt the hiſſes of a betrayed and irritated Nation.

As to you and your friends, your departure from power will not diſturb the ſerenity of your minds. The veneration and gratitude of the People will attend you in retirement, and will preſerve you from reflections, which muſt be the portion of thoſe who may be your diſmal and melancholy ſucceſſors.

Signed by Order,
THOMAS BRAUGHALL, Chairman.
JOHN SWEETMAN, Secretary.

Mr. GRATTAN's ANSWER.

GENTLEMEN,

IN ſupporting you, I ſupport the Proteſtant—we have but one intereſt and one honour, and whoever gives privileges to you, gives vigour to all—The Proteſtant already begins to perceive it—a late attack has rallied the ſcattered ſpirits of the country, from the folly of religious ſchiſm to the recollection of national honour, and a nation's feuds are loſt in a nation's reſentment. YOUR EMANCIPATION WILL PASS—rely on it, YOUR EMANCIPATION MUST PASS—it may be death to one Viceroy—it will be the peace-offering of another; and the laurel may be torn from the dead brow of one Governor, to be craftily converted into the olive of his ſucceſſor.

Let me adviſe you by no means to poſtpone the conſideration of your fortunes till after the war—rather let Britain receive the benefit of your zeal during the exigency which demands it, and you yourſelves, while you are fighting to preſerve the bleſſing of a Conſtitution, have really and *bona fide* thoſe bleſſings.

My wiſh is that you ſhould be free NOW—there is no other policy which is not low and little; let us at once inſtantly embrace, and greatly emancipate.

On this principle I mean to introduce your bill, with your permiſſion, immediately after the receſs.

You are pleaſed to ſpeak of the confidence and power with which for a moment I was ſuppoſed to have been poſſeſſed.

When his Majeſty's Miniſters were pleaſed to reſort to our ſupport, they took us with the incumbrance of our reputation, and with all our debts and mortgages which we owed to our country.

To have accepted a ſhare of confidence and council without a view to private advantage, will not meet, I hope, with the

the diſapprobation of my country; but to have accepted that ſhare without any view to public advantage, would have been refinement on the folly of ambition—Meaſures therefore, public meaſures and arrangements—and that which is now diſputed, were ſtipulated by us—were promiſed in one quarter, and with aſſurances they were not reſiſted in another.

In the ſervice of Government, under his Excellency's adminiſtration, we directed our attention to two great objects, the Kingdom and the Empire. We obtained certain beneficial laws—the diſcovery and reformation of certain abuſes, and were in progreſs to reform more—we obtained a great force, and a great ſupply with the conſent and confidence of the people—Theſe were not the meaſures of courtiers—they were the meaſures of Miniſters.

His Excellency Lord Fitzwilliam may boaſt that he offered to the empire the affections of millions, a better aid to the war than his enemies can furniſh who have forfeited thoſe affections, and put themſelves in their place.

So decidedly have the meaſures of Ireland ſerved the empire, that thoſe who were concerned in them might appeal from the cabals of the Britiſh Cabinet, to the ſenſe of the Britiſh nation. —I know of no cauſe afforded for the diſpleaſure of the Engliſh Cabinet—but if ſervices done to Ireland are crimes which cannot be atoned for by exertions for the empire, I muſt lament the gloomy proſpect of both kingdoms, and receive a diſcharge from the ſervice of Government, as the only honour an Engliſh Miniſter can confer on an Iriſh ſubject.

I conceive the continuance of Lord Fitzwilliam as neceſſary for the proſperity of this kingdom—his firm integrity is formed to correct, his mild manners to reconcile, and his private example to diſcountenance a progreſs of vulgar and rapid pollution: if he is to retire, I condole with my country—for myſelf, the pain, on that occaſion, I ſhould feel on render-

ing

ing up my ſmall portion of Miniſterial breath would be little, were it not for the gloomy proſpects afforded by thoſe *dreadful* guardians which are likely to ſucceed. I tremble at the return to power of your old Taſk-maſters—that combination which galled the country with its tyranny, inſulted her by its manners, exhauſted her by its rapacity, and ſlandered her by its malice: ſhould ſuch a combination, (at once inflamed as it muſt be now by the favour of the Britiſh Court, and by the reprobation of the Iriſh People,) return to power —I have no heſitation to ſay that THEY WILL EXTINGUISH IRELAND—OR IRELAND MUST REMOVE THEM —it is not your caſe only, but that of the nation. I find the country already committed in the ſtruggle. I beg to be committed along with her, and to abide the iſſues of her fortunes.

I ſhould have expected that there had been a wiſdom and *faith* in ſome quarter of another country, that would have prevented ſuch cataſtrophe—but I know it is no proof of that wiſdom, to take the taxes, continue the abuſes, damp the zeal, and daſh away the affection of ſo important a member of the empire as the people of Ireland; and when this country came forward, cordial and confident with the offering of her treaſure and blood, and reſolute to ſtand or fall with the Britiſh nation; it is, I ſay, no proof of wiſdom or generoſity, to ſelect that moment to plant a dagger in her heart.

But whatſoever ſhall be the event, I will adhere to her intereſts to the laſt moment of my life.

HENRY GRATTAN.

THE

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

HENRY GRATTAN'S

ADDRESS, &c.

MY FELLOW-CITIZENS OF DUBLIN!

I THANK you for paſt favours; I have found in you kind and gracious Maſters—you have found in me an unprofitable Servant;—under that impreſſion I beg to aſſure you, that ſo long as the preſent ſtate of Repreſentation in the Commons Houſe continues, ſo long muſt I reſpectfully decline the honour of ſoliciting at your hands a ſeat in that Aſſembly.

On this principle it was I withdrew from Parliament, together with thoſe with whom I act—and I now exerciſe my privilege, and diſcharge my duty in communicating with my Conſtituents, at the eve of a General Election, ſome ſay an immediate Diſſolution, when I am to render back a truſt, which, until Parliament ſhall be reformed, I do not aſpire to re-aſſume. The account of the moſt material parts of my conduct, together with the reaſon of my reſolution, will be the ſubject of this letter.

When I ſpeak of my conduct, I mean that adopted in common and in concert with the other Gentlemen. We ſhould have felt ourſelves deficient in duty if we had not made one effort before the cloſe of the Parliament, for the reſtoration of domeſtic peace, by the only means by which it ſeemed attainable—conciliation;—and if we had not ſubmitted

mitted our opinions, however fallible, and our anxieties, however inſignificant, on a ſubject which in its exiſtence ſhook your ſtate, and in its conſequences muſt ſhake the empire. Our opinion was, that the origin of the evil, the ſource of the diſcontent, and the parent of the diſturbance was to be traced to an ill-ſtarred and deſtructive endeavour, on the part of the Miniſter of the Crown, to give to the Monarch a power which the Conſtitution never intended: to render the King in Parliament every thing, and the People nothing; and to work the People completely out of the Houſe of Commons, and in their place to ſeat and eſtabliſh the Chief Magiſtrate abſolute and irreſiſtible; it appeared to us that a Miniſter guilty of ſuch a crime, is as much a traitor to the Conſtitution, as the People would be to the King, if they ſhould advance in arms, and place their leader on the Throne —more guilty of treaſon in equity and juſtice—becauſe in them it would be only rebellion againſt their creature, the King—but in the other it would be rebellion againſt his creator, the People: it occurred to us, that in this country the offence would be ſtill higher, becauſe in this country, it would be the introduction not only of a deſpotic but of a foreign yoke, and the revival of that great queſtion which in 1782 agitated this country, and which, 'till your Parliament ſhall be reformed, muſt agitate this country for ever. We thought no Iriſhman—we were ſure no honeſt Iriſhman would ever be in heart with Government, ſo long as the Parliament of this country ſhall be influenced by the Cabinet of England, and were convinced that the people would not be the more reconciled to a foreign yoke, becauſe re-impoſed by the help of their own countrymen; as long as they think this to be the caſe, we were convinced they will hate the Adminiſtration, and the Adminiſtration will hate them; on this principle we recollect the Parliament of this country pledged their lives and fortunes in 1782—though ſome ſeem to have thought better of it ſince, and are ready to pledge their lives and fortunes againſt this principle. We could

not

not ſeriouſly believe, that the people of Ireland were ready to reſiſt the legiſlative uſurpation of the Britiſh Parliament, in whoſe ſtation the greatneſs of the tyrant would have qualified the condition of the ſlave—and that the ſame people were now ready to proſtrate themſelves to the legiſlative uſurpation of another body—a Britiſh Cabinet—a humiliated, and a tame tyrant. We recollected to have heard, that the friends of Miniſtry had lamented that England had not acceded to the American claim of excluſive legiſlature—and afterward attempted to re-eſtabliſh Britiſh dominion, by influencing the American Aſſembly. We ſaw the Miniſtry purſue that very plan toward Ireland which they regretted they had not reſorted to in the caſe of America. We need not repeat the particulars—but we ſaw the reſult to be on the mind of the people a deep-rooted and eſtabliſhed diſcontent and jealouſy, and we conceived that whatever conſpiracies exiſted in any extent or degree, proceeded from that original and parent conſpiracy in the Miniſter to ſubvert the Parliamentary Conſtitution by the influence of the Crown. It appeared to us, that the diſcontent and diſturbance ſo created, was greatly encreaſed by another cauſe, the treatment of his Majeſty's Catholic ſubjects. It is the buſineſs of the Miniſter to obſerve the changes in the national ſpirit, as much as the changes of foreign combinations;—it was the misfortune of our Miniſtry that they never attended to thoſe changes; they did not perceive that the religious principle and temper, as well as the political, had undergone on the Continent, in America, and in Ireland, a fundamental alteration; that the example of America had had prodigious effect on Europe; the example and doctrine of Europe had had no effect on America; they did not ſee that in conſequence of that cauſe (there were other cauſes alſo) the Iriſh Catholic of 1792 did not bear the ſmalleſt reſemblance to the Iriſh Catholic of 1692; that the influence of Pope, Prieſt, and Pretender were at an end.—Other dangers, and other influences might have ariſen—new objects and new

paſſions;

paſſions;—the mind of the people is never ſtationary—the mind of courts is often ſtagnant, but thoſe new dangers were to be provided againſt in a manner very different from the proviſions made againſt the old. Indeed, the continuation of the old ſyſtem of ſafety approximated and ſecured the new danger—unfortunately our Miniſters did not think ſo; they thought, they ſaid, that the Iriſh Catholic, notwithſtanding the American revolution, notwithſtanding the French revolution, religious as well as political, was ſtill the bigot of the laſt century—that with reſpect to him the age had ſtood ſtill---that he was not impreſſed with the new ſpirit of liberty, but ſtill moped under the old ſpirit of bigotry, and ruminated on the triumph of the croſs, the power of Catholic Hierarchy, the riches of the Catholic Clergy, and the ſplendour of the Catholic Church. You will find the ſpeeches of the Catholic opponents, particularly the Miniſterial declaimers, dream on in this manner, and you will find from the publication of thoſe ſpeeches, and of the Catholics, that the latter had laid aſide their prejudice, but that the Miniſters had not: and one of the cauſes why thoſe Miniſters alledged that the Catholic mind had not advanced, was, that their own mind had ſtood ſtill; the State was the bigot, and the People the philoſopher. The progreſs of the human mind in the courſe of the laſt twenty five years, has been prodigious in Ireland. I remember when there ſcarcely appeared a publication in a newſpaper of any degree of merit which was not traced to ſome perſon of note, on the part of Government or the Oppoſition; but now a multitude of very powerful publications appear from authors entirely unknown, of profound and ſpirited inveſtigation. There was a time when all learning in Europe was confined to the Clergy---it then advanced among the higher orders of the Laity, and now it has gone among the People: and when once the powers of intellect are poſſeſſed by the great body of the nation, 'tis madneſs to hope to impoſe on that nation civil or religious oppreſſion, particularly in thoſe

whoſe

whoſe underſtandings have been ſtationary, though their power and riches have been progreſſive. The politics of the Caſtle, with the religious feuds of Ireland, had occupied and engroſſed their mind---the eye of that mind or their intellectual viſion had become of courſe ſubtile indeed, but extremely little---on the other hand, the politics of Europe and America had occupied the mind of the people; and therefore the mind of the people had become comprehenſive —and when the former complained of the preſs, they complained of the ſuperiority of the popular underſtanding. It appeared to us, that the beſt remedy was to raiſe the underſtanding of the great by enlarging the ſphere of its actions; viz. Reforming the Parliament.---But to return.---The Miniſtry however thought proper to perſiſt in hoſtility to the Catholic body on a falſe ſuppoſition of its bigotry: the conſequence of ſuch an attempt was, that the great body of the Catholics, I mean that part the moſt popular and energetic, diſappointed, ſuſpected, reviled and wearied, united with that other great body of reformers, and formed a Catholic, Preſbyterian, and Proteſtant league, for the freedom of that religion, and the free and full repreſentation of the people. Out of this league a new political religion aroſe, ſuperſeding in political matter, all influence of prieſt and parſon, and burying for ever theological diſcord in the love of civil and political liberty. This is at preſent in all political matters the Iriſh religion. What is the Iriſh religion? Unanimity againſt Deſpotiſm.---Viewing the ſtate of the country in this light, it appeared to us that the unconſtitutional influence of the Crown, and the proſcription of the Catholics, were the fundamental cauſes of our diſcontent and jealouſy: with theſe there exiſted other diſcontents diſtinct from theſe cauſes; without theſe cauſes inſignificant, but with theſe cauſes creating great agitation and diſturbance.

Two remedies occurred---coercion and conciliation: we oppoſed the former, and propoſed the latter---I will trouble you with our reaſons: we conſidered the ſyſtem of coercion

cion would in the firſt inſtance deſtroy the liberty of the people—and in the ſecond inſtance would ſubvert the authority and powers of Government. Here I beg to recur to what I have juſt obſerved on the neceſſity for thoſe who adminiſter a country to advert to the changes that take place in the temper and underſtanding of the people. Unfortunately the Miniſtry provided, for the purpoſe of making the people quiet and contented, a ſyſtem of laws and proclamations, which had they been quiet before would have rendered them diſtracted. I need not repeat them—we all know them—we had the barren office of giving it fruitleſs oppoſition—we ſaw a ſpirit of reform had gone forth—it had conquered in America—it had conquered in France—both here and in England it exiſted, and was chiefly nouriſhed and propagated by the abuſes of our Government.—It appeared to us that the beſt way of ſtarving that ſpirit was to remove its food; far otherwiſe the propoſers of the plan of coercion;—they thought it better to feed that ſpirit and to cheriſh the abuſes and encreaſe them—they hoped to fortify their Conſtitution againſt an epidemic diſtemper, by preſerving uncured the old gouts and rheumatiſms, and a hoſt of other diſorders. The power of limited monarchy was not to be preſerved by conſtitutional power, which is its natural ally; but by deſpotic power, which is its natural death and diſſolution. Inſtead of correcting the abuſes of the State, they invented laws which were themſelves an abuſe, and proclamations which were an abuſe alſo; and which greatly, though ſilently, propagated the new principle.—There are two ways by which a new principle ſpreads—one is by arms—and by martyrdom the other. The Mahometan religion was propagated by arms—it pleaſed Providence that the Chriſtian religion ſhould have been propagated by the latter.—See whether the unfortunate choice of our Miniſters has not given to the new principle the benefit of both—they have fled before it abroad, and they have trampled on it at home, and given it the double recommendation of conqueſt and martyrdom. This conſideration

was

was one of my objections to perſiſt in the war with France, on account of Brabant, and it is one of my objections to perſiſt in a war with the Iriſh on account of venal boroughs. Had the Government inſtead of aggravating, reſtrained abuſes, they would have put the State at the head of a ſpirit of Reform, which they could no longer reſiſt, and could only hope to moderate—it was to ſuch a policy, adopted by Queen Elizabeth, that the church of England owes principally what it retains of power and ſplendour preſerved by the Government of the Country who took the lead in the Reformation —but ours fell into a different project—they armed cap-a-pie againſt a ſpirit which they could not confine by arms abroad nor by execution at home, and therefore inſtead of being at the head of popular meaſures, they were at the tail of them; in the Catholic queſtion, in the place bill, in the penſion bill, in every bill of a popular tendency—they reſiſted at firſt, they yielded at laſt, reluctantly and imperfectly, and then oppoſed, condemned and betrayed the principle of their own acquieſcence—they agreed to a place bill for inſtance, and then they multiplied places manifold.—What is the bar bill or the bill that creates thirty new places for the Gentlemen of the Law? They agreed to the firſt Catholic bill, and then proſcribed the perſon of the Catholic, and oppoſed his freedom in corporations; they had before agreed to the eſtabliſhment of the independency of the Iriſh Parliament, and then had created a multitude of officers to make that independency a name. It is reported to have been ſaid by ſome of the Miniſters of England, that his Majeſty's reign has been to Ireland a courſe of conceſſion, and it was much a ſubject of wonder that the people of Ireland ſhould perſiſt in their diſſatisfaction.—The anſwer to thoſe Miniſters is obvious, the conceſſions were extorted from Miniſters by the perſeverance of Oppoſition, and they were rendered abortive by the treachery of Miniſters. The recognition of our Parliamentary Rights has been rendered abortive by unexampled exertions of bribery and corruption;

ruption; the freedom of our trade by debt and war, and the elective privileges of our Catholics by a courſe of perſonal perſecution, and corporate influence, and on the whole the benefit of Conſtitutional laws, by the adminiſtration of an unconſtitutional Government. When the Miniſters talk of their conceſſions to Ireland, do they know the conceſſions of Ireland to them? do they know the debt of the war? Continue that rate of expence, and the Engliſh wars of the next century will have the ſame effect as the Engliſh prohibition of the laſt—they will annihilate the trade of Ireland. But to return to the Adminiſtration. They relapſed into their violence when they recovered from their fears, and their ſyſtem has been therefore occaſionally violent and weak, never ſtrong and uniform. It is an obſervation of Lord Bacon, that the fall of one of the Roman Emperors was not due to his tyranny nor his relaxation, but to both, and that the fluctuating ſyſtem is ever fatal.—'Tis an obſervation of the ſame author, that the way to reſiſt the progreſs of a new ſect is to correct the abuſes of the old ones. Unhappily our Miniſters differed from Bacon---their ſyſtem was faithful to no one principle, either of violence or conceſſion. We objected that it could not now reſort to unqualified violence without incurring all the objections belonging to a policy of ſubmiſſion coupled with a policy of violence, and that it could not hope to obtain the advantages appertaining to either. In purſuit of ſuch a ſyſtem the Miniſtry ſeemed to us to have loſt not only their diſcretion but their temper---they ſeemed vexed with themſelves for being angry---they ſeemed to become in a paſſion with themſelves, becauſe they had loſt their temper with the people---in its ſtruggle with popular rights, the State, like a furious wreſtler, loſt its breath as well as its dignity---as if an angry father ſhould loſe his temper with his child, in which caſe the old fool is moſt incorrigible: in the mean time the enemy ſeemed to underſtand our ſituation perfectly well, and relied on our expences for diſſolving our credit, and our intemperance for diſſolving our authority; and at the very time when

when we were precipitating on ſuch meaſures at home, we were receiving the moſt melancholy communications from abroad; we ſaw the Miniſter retreating from the enemy with as rapid a ſtep as he advanced upon the people, going back, and back, and back, while the Democratic principle in Europe was getting on and on, like a miſt at the heels of the countryman, ſmall at firſt and lowly, but ſoon aſcending to the hills and overcaſting the hemiſphere. Like the Government we wiſhed to provide againſt this ſtorm; like the Government we wiſhed to diſarm the people; as the beſt means of ſafety, we wiſhed to diſarm the people; but it was by the only method by which a free people can be diſarmed—we wiſhed to diſarm the people of their grievances, and then their other arms, their leſs dangerous arms, the bayonet, and even the pike, would be retained for no other uſe but the uſe of the Government. A naked man oppreſſed by the State is an armed poſt. A few decent Biſhops ſent to the Tower againſt law produced the Revolution. Mr. Hamden and the four other innocent perſons arraigned by Charles I. for high treaſon, produced the civil war;---that grey-coated man, or the green man ſent on board a tender, or detained in priſon without trial, he, too, will have his political conſequence.---Senſible acts of violence have an epidemic force—they operate by ſympathy—they poſſeſs the air as it were by certain tender influences, and ſpread the kindred paſſion through the whole of the community.—No wonder that difficulties have encreaſed on the Government! Sad experiment!—to blood the magiſtracy with the poor man's liberty, and employ the rich like a pack of Government blood-hounds to hunt down the poor! Acts of violence like theſe put an end to all law as well as liberty, or the affectation and appearance of either.—In the courſe of the ſeſſion we aſked, To what end all this? and accompanied our queſtion by ſtating the enfeebled reſources of the country—we had mentioned at the beginning that the debt of the war had been

about 5,000,000l. we were told that it was an error; I wiſh it had been ſo; but, on examination, that ſum appeared ſomewhat about the debt of the war. And it will appear, if the preſent loans are filled, that the debt of the war will be near 8,000,000l. We ſubmitted to the effects of the war on the reſources of the country, and here again it was ſaid we were in error; I wiſh we had been ſo: But at what intereſt does the ſtate borrow money? an intereſt which between man and man would be uſury, and nearly double the former rate. We mentioned the ſtate of the revenue to have declined: Again we were contradicted: But what is the fact? What buſineſs is now done on the quay?—We did not wiſh to reveal the *arcana imperii*; we ſtated nothing more than appeared from the terms propoſed in the Gazette, from the returns of your Cuſtom-houſe, and the printed reſolutions touching the ſtate of your manufactures: and we ſtated thoſe public facts, not to damp the public confidence in the defence of the country, but to abate a little of that frantic confidence manifeſted in a determination, at the hazard of her ſafety, to go on with a ſyſtem of domeſtic coercion, till the Miniſter ſhould conquer the People—and of foreign war, till the ſame Miniſter ſhould achieve another conqueſt at the riſque of general ruin—till he ſhould, ſword in hand, recover Brabant: that Miniſter has found it a more preſſing experiment to defend Cork than to take Flanders, as the Emperor has found it a ſafer experiment to abandon Flanders and Italy to ſave Vienna. We mentioned thoſe our objections to ſuch folly then, and I repeat them now, not to damp your zeal againſt a foreign enemy, but to confine the zeal of Government to one enemy, and to deprecate a ſecond enemy,—our own people, and a civil war added to a foreign one.—Such was the ſyſtem of coercion. To oppoſe a remedy is eaſy; to propoſe one is difficult and grating; it appeared to us that we ſhould fail in duty and in candour, if, when we reſiſted the project of Government, we did not ſubmit a plan of our own, and the only plan that appeared to

us

us to promiſe peace and proſperity was conciliation; we propoſed accordingly, the Emancipation of the Catholics, and a Reform in the Commons Houſe of Parliament. To the firſt it was objected, that ſuch a meaſure was irreconcileable with the ſafety of the King or the connexion with England. To the firſt objection we anſwered, that the capacities of three-fourths of the people ſhould not be made a perſonal compliment to his Majeſty, and that the pretence for taking away thoſe capacities ſhould not be the religion of his Majeſty's allies, of his preſent ſubjects of Canada, of his late ſubjects of Corſica, of a conſiderable part of his fleet, and of a great part of his army; that the principles that placed his family on the throne were thoſe of Liberty; and that his Iriſh ſubjects, if not convicted of felony, were entitled to the benefit of thoſe principles: and that the Catholics have in juſtice and reaſon at leaſt as good a right to Liberty as his Majeſty has to the Crown. We obſerved, that the only impediment to the Catholic claim, as the law now ſtands, was the oath requiring the abjuration of the worſhip of the Virgin Mary, and of the doctrine of the real preſence; that to make theſe points, at ſuch a time as this, matter of alarm to the ſafety of the King, was to give an air of ridicule to the ſerious calamities in which thoſe his Miniſters had involved him; that ſuch opinions, now abſtracted from foreign politics, it was beyond the right or the power of the State to ſettle or puniſh; that Kings had no right to enter into the tabernacle of the human mind, and hang up there the images of their own orthodoxy; that the Catholics did not inſiſt his Majeſty ſhould be of their religion; that his Majeſty had no right to exact that the Catholics ſhould be of his; that we know of no royal rule either for religion or mathematics; and indeed the diſtance between divine and human nature being infinite, the proportion in that reference between the King and the ſubject is loſt, and therefore in matters of religion they both are equally dark, and ſhould be equally humble; and when Courts or Kings aſſume a dictation on that ſubject, they aſ-

ſume a familiarity with the Almighty, which is exceſs of blaſphemy as well as of blindneſs. Our contemplation, the moſt profound on Divine Nature, can only lead us to one great concluſion, our own immeaſurable inanity; from whence we ſhould learn, that we can never ſerve God but in ſerving his creature; and to think we ſerve God by a profuſion of prayer, when we degrade and proſcribe his creature and our fellow-creature, was to ſuppoſe Heaven, like the Court of Princes, a region of flattery, and that man can there procure a holy connivance at his inhumanity, on the perſonal application of luxurious and complimentary devotion. Or, if the argument were to deſcend from religious to moral ſtudy, ſurely, ſurely Miniſters ſhould have remembered that the Catholics had contributed greatly to the expences of the war, and had bled profuſely therein; that they themſelves were much in debt to human nature, and ſhould not loſe that one opportunity of paying a very ſmall part of it, merely by a reſtoration of loyal ſubjects to their own inheritance, their liberty. We ſuggeſted ſuch a ſtep as a meaſure of policy as well as juſtice, with a view to the ſtrength and power of his Majeſty, who was moſt improperly made a bar to ſuch a conceſſion. We ſuggeſted that his ſituation with regard to America—to Europe—to his allies and enemies, was critical; and that it was a mockery of that ſituation to ſuppoſe, that the worſhip of the Virgin Mary, or the doctrine of the real preſence, conſtituted any part of the Royal difficulties; that there was no ſpectre to diſturb the Royal imagination, but an exiſting ſubſtance—a gigantic form walked the earth at this moment, who ſmote Crowns with a hundred hands, and opened for the ſeduction of their ſubjects a hundred arms---Democracy; and we implored Miniſters againſt ſuch an enemy to ally and identify the King with all his people, without diſtinction of religion, and not to detach him from any part of them to make a miſerable alliance with Prieſtcraft, which was a falling cauſe, and a ſuperannuated folly. With regard to the danger offered to the connexion with England from the emancipation of the Catholics,

Catholics, we obſerved, that the argument was of a moſt dangerous and inſulting nature, for it amounted to a declaration that the privileges of a vaſt portion of a nation ſhould be ſacrificed to another country; that it was not the old internal queſtion, Whether the privileges of one part of Ireland ſhould be ſacrificed to the ambition of the other, but whether a vaſt deſcription of the people of Ireland ſhould be ſacrificed to England? we obſerved, that in this part of the argument we need not recur to juſtice, we might rely on policy; and we aſked, Was it the policy of England for the purity of Iriſh faith to make experiments on Iriſh allegiance? We did not wiſh to exaggerate---but were juſtified in making this ſuppoſition---ſuppoſe Ireland the ſeat of Government, and that for the better ſecuring the ſafety of the King, here reſident, and for the connexion of Great Britain with Ireland, that the Iriſh ſhould incapacitate all the Proteſtants of England? the ſame affection which England, on that ſuppoſition, would afford to the Iriſh, the ſame affection ſhe has now a right to expect from Ireland. When England has conquered France, poſſeſſed America, guided the councils of Pruſſia, directed Holland, and intimidated Spain; when ſhe was the great weſtern oracle, to which the nations of the earth repaired, from whence to draw eternal oracles of policy and freedom ---when her root extended from continent to continent, and the dew of the two hemiſpheres watered her branches---then, indeed, we allowed with leſs danger, but never with juſtice, ſhe might have made ſacrifice to the claims of the Iriſh. I do not mean, we did not mean, to preſs a ſenſe of the change which has taken place in the power of England, further than to prevent further changes more mortifying and deciſive, and to impreſs on Great Britain this important conviction, that as Ireland is neceſſary to her, ſo is complete and perfect liberty neceſſary to Ireland, and that both iſlands muſt be drawn much cloſer to a free Conſtitution, that they may be drawn cloſer to one another. The ſecond part of our plan of conciliation was the Reform of Parliament. The object of the plan was, to reſtore the Houſe of Commons to the people.

If

If the plan do not accompliſh that, it is not the idea of the framers; but no plan could ſatisfy thoſe perſons who wiſhed to retain the credit of Reformers and the influence of Boroughs —no plan could ſatisfy thoſe who complained when any veſtige of borough influence was continued, that the Parliament was not reformed, and when the veſtiges were ſwept away, that the Conſtitution was demoliſhed---no plan could ſatisfy thoſe who deſired that the boroughs ſhould be deſtroyed and preſerved, and were willing to let the people ſit in the Houſe of Commons, provided the Ariſtocracy ſat in their lap. It is in favour of the plan ſubmitted, that, without any communication whatever with the other ſide of the water, it bears a ſtrong and cloſe reſemblance to the plan propoſed in the Parliament of Great Britain, and in that reſemblance carries with it a preſumption that it has foundation in common ſenſe and common intereſt; the objections to it, founded on the preſumed antiquity of the borough ſyſtem, hardly ventured to make their appearance; examination into the ſubject had ſhown, that the greater part of the Iriſh boroughs were creations by the houſe of Stuart, for the avowed purpoſe of modelling and ſubverting the Parliamentary Conſtitution of Ireland; that theſe were underſtated, when called abuſes in the Conſtitution, that they were groſs and monſtrous violations, recent and wicked innovations, and fatal uſurpations on the Conſtitution by Kings whoſe family loſt the Throne for crimes leſs deadly to freedom, and who in their Star-Chamber tyranny---in their Court of High Commiſſion---in their Ship-money, or in their diſpenſing power, did not commit an act ſo diabolical in intention, ſo mortal in principle, or ſo radically ſubverſive of the foundamental rights of the realm, as the fabrication of boroughs, which is the fabrication of a Court Parliament, and the excluſion of a Conſtitutional Commons, and which is a ſubverſion, not of the fundamental laws, but of the Conſtitutional Lawgiver; you baniſh that family for the other acts, and you retain that act by which they have baniſhed the Commons.

It

It was objected with more ſucceſs that the conſtitution of boroughs, however in theory defective, has worked well in fact; but it appeared to us that this was an hiſtoric error—we ſtated, in anſwer to that objection, that the birth of the borough inundation, was the deſtruction of liberty and property—that James I. the King who made that inundation, by that means deſtroyed the titles of his Iriſh ſubjects to their lands, without the leaſt ceremony—the robbery of his liberty was immediately followed by the robbery of his property: for, rely on it, the King that takes liberty will very ſoon take away property—he will rob the ſubject of his liberty by influence; and then he may plunder him of his property by ſtatute. There were at that time, the Hiſtorian adds, inferior grievances: What were they? martial law and extortion by the ſoldiers, in levying the King's duties—a criminal juriſdiction exerciſed by the Caſtle chamber, and a judicial power by the Council. Theſe inferior and thoſe ſuperior grievances, amounted to no law at all. How could it happen, ſays the Hiſtorian, that the King could do all this with ſo ſmall an army, ſeize the properties of the ſubjects, and tranſport the inhabitants? I will preſume to conjecture;—the King had another inſtrument, more ſubtile and more pliable than the ſword—and againſt the liberty of the ſubject, more cold and deadly, a Court inſtrument, that murders freedom without the mark of blood—palls itſelf in the covering of the conſtitution, and in her own colours, and in her name plants the dagger, a borough Parliament. Under this borough ſyſtem, the reign of James was bad, but the next was worſe; the grievances which England complained of under Charles I. were committed in Ireland alſo.—Thoſe meaſures I mean called the new Councils—they had been aggravated here by an attempt to confiſcate the province of Connaught: there is extant a correſpondence on the ſubject of Ireland, between the King and his Deputy, Lord Strafford, of a moſt criminal and diſguſting nature; his Majeſty begins by profeſſing his general horror of the

the conſtitution—he proceeds to acknowledge his particular injuries to the Iriſh: he owned that he had defrauded the Iriſh of their promiſed graces, and he expoſed his fears that they had a right in juſtice to aſk what it was his intereſt, as it appeared to be his determination, to refuſe. His Deputy—what does he do? he exceeds his royal maſter in his zeal againſt the pretenſions of Ireland. A judicious Court ſycophant will often flatter the Court of St. James, by Iriſh ſacrifice, whether it is the Conſtitution, or the fair name of the country. He, the Deputy, had, ſaid the Hiſtorian, two great objects—one was to fleece the people of Ireland, and the other was to cheat them—to get the money, and to elude the graces. He ſucceeded—Why? becauſe there was another—a third inſtrument, worſe than himſelf—a borough Parliament—that borough Parliament met—it voted ſix ſubſidies, and redreſſed nothing—this is virtue and public ſpirit, in compariſon to what it did after—after committing theſe crimes, for which the Deputy juſtly loſt his head—after having ſeized part of the province of Connaught—after inflicting martial law—monopolies—raiſing an army againſt law—and money to pay that army againſt law—after fining and confining againſt law—the borough Parliament vote that Deputy an extraordinary ſupply, and in the preamble of the act they paſs on that Deputy an extraordinary panegyric, with ſuch a thorough conviction of his iniquity and their own, that they after impeach that very Miniſter for thoſe very acts, and record a proteſtation againſt the record of their panegyric, to give way to the meanneſs of another borough Parliament, who, on the return of his family, cancels the record of the proteſtation, to reſtore the force of the panegyric; maſſacre—confuſion—civil war—religious fury—followed naturally, and of courſe. Here you ſee hatched and matured, the egg that produced the maſſacre, and all that brood of mortal conſequences.

The principles of right were rooted out of the land by Government—and they were amazed at anarchy! the barriers

ries againſt inundation were removed by the Government—and they were aſtoniſhed to be overwhelmed by a popular torrent! the principles of robbery were planted by the Deputy—and the Government were ſurpriſed at the growth of popular pillage! Had the country been left to a ſtate of barbarous nature, ſhe could not have been ſo ſhattered and convulſed, as when thus reduced to a ſtate of barbarous art,—where the Government had vitiated that Parliamentary Conſtitution it profeſſed to introduce; and had introduced, without profeſſing it, influence—not civilization; had ſet one order of the nation in feud againſt the other—had tainted the gentry with the itch of venality (there was bribery, in thoſe days, as well as violence), and had given them ideas of vice, but not days of refinement. I paſs over a hundred and thirty years, a horrid vacuum in your hiſtory of borough Parliaments—ſave only as it has been filled with four horrid images, in the four-fold proſcription of the religion, trade, of the Judicative, and Legiſlative authority of the country—by the commercial reſtrictions of William, the penal laws of William and Anne, and the declaratory act of the 6th of George: and I come to the boundary of the gulph, where the conſtitution begins to ſtir and live in an octennial bill—accompanied, however, with, and corrected by a court project of new parliamentary influence and degradation:—This project may be called a court plan for reforming borough parliaments—but reforming them, not on the principle of popular repreſentation, but of a more complete and perfect excluſion and baniſhment of the Commons. The people had begun to form certain combinations with the Oligarchy—and, like weeds, began to grow a little about the doors and courts of their own Houſes of Parliament—and, like weeds, it was thought proper to baniſh them; and as Government had before reſorted to the creation of boroughs to overwhelm the Commons, ſo now they reſorted to a new hoſt of places and penſions, to overwhelm the Oligarchy. This is the famous half million, or the experiment of the Caſtle, to ſecure

cure the dependance of Parliament, and to prevent the formation of an Iriſh party againſt the domination of a Britiſh Cabinet. The Court could not then, like the 1ſt James and the 1ſt Charles, command to riſe up a new fabric of boroughs, like a regal Pandemonium, to conſtitute a regal Houſe of Commons: it therefore engendered a young and numerous family of places and penſions, to bribe, and to buy, and to ſplit and ſhatter, and to corrupt the Oligarchy. Thus were the People once more excluded from the chance of influence in Parliament—and, as it were, ſhouldered from the threſhold of their own houſe, by a hoſt of placemen and penſioners, who had left the cauſe of the Country, to follow the fortunes of the Ariſtocracy—and now left the Ariſtocracy, to follow the fortunes of the Court—and then voted new loans and new taxes, to furniſh wages for the double apoſtacy. You had now but little to give up—and that little you ſurrendered: you gave your proviſion-trade, by an embargo of 76, to the contractors—and you ſurrendered by new loans and taxes, your revenues to the Miniſter. You accompanied theſe ſacrifices with the unvarying felicitations of borough Parliaments, on the virtues of Government, on the great and growing proſperity of your country and her commerce —which bring the poor progreſs of the country, your borough hiſtory, and that of your Chief Governors (a continuation of Rapine, they have been wittily called) to the cataſtrophe of 79, which found your ſtate a bankrupt, and your community a beggar—and which induced Parliament to declare, that ſuch has been the working of your borough ſyſtem, and ſuch the ſenſe of that Parliament reſpecting it, that nothing but a free trade could ſave the country from impending ruin. I wiſh to ſpeak with all honours of the Parliament at that moment; but muſt recollect the circumſtances of that moment. Why did Parliament expreſs itſelf in that manner, at that time, and demand its rights a ſhort time after? becauſe Parliament was, at thoſe moments, in contact with the People—and it is the object of the Reform that ſhe

ſhould

ſhould continue in contact with the People always, and with the Miniſter never, except the People ſhould be in contact with him: that Parliament declared, that nothing could ſave this country from impending ruin, except a free trade; but in declaring that, it declared much more; it proteſted againſt theſe borough Parliaments of a century, who had acquieſced in the loſs of a free trade; who had ſuffered the country to be reduced to that ſtate of impending ruin, for want of that free trade; and who had beheld the approaches of that ruin with a profuſion of thanks, and a regular felicitation on the growing proſperity and flouriſhing commerce of a ruined country: and that Parliament did, by neceſſary inference, declare, to ſave the country from returning to that ſtate of ruin, that it was abſolutely neceſſary to reform the ſtate and model of thoſe borough Parliaments; and, therefore, is an authority for a popular repreſentation, as well as for a free trade: indeed, it not only proclaimed the neceſſity, but conſtituted it; for in a ſhort time after, it gave this country a new political ſituation; wherein ſhe ceaſed to be a province, and became a nation; and, of courſe, it rendered thoſe borough Parliaments that were adequate to the management of a province, abſurd and inapplicable, when that province became a nation. A province muſt be governed with a view to the intereſt of another country—a nation with a view to her own intereſt; a borough Parliament was, therefore, not only competent to govern a province, but the only kind of Parliament fit for the degradation of ſuch a ſervice; and, for that very reaſon, it was the moſt unfit and inadmiſſible inſtrument in the government of a nation; for the principle of its birth, being, in that caſe, oppoſite to the principle of its duty—the principle of its birth being court intrigue with touched and tainted contractors, and the principle of its duty being the defence of the nation againſt ſuch intrigue and ſuch contractor—the nature of Parliament being oppoſed to its duty, or its duty to its parent being in contradiction with its duty to its country—it follows, that the nation, in ſuch a caſe, muſt be re-provincialized; and the independency ſuppoſed

poſed to have been by them obtained, at that period, would have been only a transfer of dependency, from the Parliament of Great Britain to the Court of St. James's, in covin and in couple with the borough-brokers of Ireland: therefore the independency of your Parliament, and the full and free repreſentation of your People, are terms ſynonimous and commenſurate. In oppoſition to this hiſtory, and theſe arguments, ſubmitted in different ſhapes to the Houſe, in ſupport of Parliamentary Reform, it was replied, that the borough conſtitution had worked well, at leaſt ſince 1782—for before no man will contend for it—and that the country had greatly advanced in commerce and in tillage; and, indeed, as far as the plowman and the weaver are concerned, too much cannot be ſaid to juſtify againſt every charge of ſloth, the character of the IRISHMAN—and to vindicate againſt a vulgar error, the native energy of a ſtrong, hardy, bold, brave, laborious, warm-hearted, and FAITHFUL RACE OF MEN;—but as far as that boaſt goes to political meaſures, we cannot ſo well expreſs our deteſtation of them as by recital: the propoſitions; the new taxes, without the trade; the new debt, notwithſtanding the new taxes; the ſale of the Peerage; the ſurrender of the Eaſt India trade for the re-export trade; the refuſal of the re-export trade, without ſuch barter; the inequality of the channel trade; and the preſent provincial tariff ſuffered ſtill to obtain between the two countries; 8,000,000l. of loan voted, on account of the war, without commercial compenſation, liberality, or equality; the encreaſe of Offices, for the profeſſed purpoſe of procuring a majority; another encreaſe of offices ſince, the place-bill; the bar-bill; the convention-bill; the gun-powder bill; the indemnity-bill; the ſecond indemnity-bill; the inſurrection-bill; the ſuſpenſion of the habeas corpus; General Lake's proclamation, by order of Government; the approbation afforded to that proclamation; the ſubſequent proclamation of Government, more military and deciſive; the order to the military, to act without waiting

for

for the civil power; the impriſonment of the middle orders without law; the detaining them in priſon, without bringing them to trial; the tranſporting them without law; burning their houſes; burning their villages; murdering them; crimes many of which are public, and many committed which are concealed, by the ſuppreſſion of a free preſs, by military force; the preventing the legal meetings of counties to petition his Majeſty, by orders acknowledged to be given to the military to diſperſe them; ſubverting the ſubjects' right to petition—and finally, the introduction of practices, not only unknown to law, but unknown to civilized and chriſtian countries.——Such has been the working of the borough ſyſtem; nor could ſuch meaſures have taken place but for that ſyſtem. Such practices, however, have, in part, been defended as acts of power, neceſſary to prevent inſurrection, and puniſh conſpiracy: but it appeared to us, that in theſe practices Government was combating effects, and not cauſes; and that thoſe practices encreaſe theſe cauſes—and, therefore, will encreaſe thoſe effects: that, admitting every charge of conſpiracy and diſſaffection in its fulleſt extent—*that* conſpiracy and diſſaffection are only effects of that great fundamental cauſe—that *parent* conſpiracy, formed ſome years ago, to procure, by corruption, deſpotic power. That is the cauſe—and that cauſe acts according to the reception of its matter, and the tempers and conſtitutions to which it applies; and therefore produces, in ſome men diſloyalty, in ſome men republicaniſm, in ſome the ſpirit of reform---but in all, deep, great, and growing diſcontent. That is the cauſe and the poiſon which has made ſome men mad, and all men ſick: and, though the government may not be able to reſtore reaſon to the mad, or loyalty to the republican---yet, if they mean to reſtore health to the ſick---if they mean to reſtore content and confidence to all, to moſt, or to any conſiderable portion of the People, they muſt take away the poiſon---they muſt remove the cauſe---they muſt reform the Parliament. They have told us at

ſome

ſome times, and at other times they have ſaid the contrary, that it is a ſpirit of plunder, not politics, that is abroad: idle talk! whatever be the crime of the preſent ſpirit, it is not the crime of theft---if ſo, it were eaſily put down; no, it is a political, not a predatory ſpirit: it is the ſpirit of political reformation, carried to different degrees; to liberty in moſt inſtances---to ambition in others---and to power in others: and even in thoſe caſes where charged to be carried to confiſcation, it is evident, from the charge itſelf, that confiſcation looks to political vengeance, not to private plunder; and therefore the beſt way of laying that ſpirit, of whatever deſigns or intents, is to lay the pre-exiſting ſpirit of unlawful power and unconſtitutional influence, that has frighted the People from Parliament, and has called to our world that other potent and uncircumſcribed apparition---The way to defend your property is to defend your liberty; and the beſt method to ſecure your Houſe againſt a Defender, is to ſecure the Commons Houſe againſt a Miniſter. "There was ambition, there was ſedition, there was violence, mixing in "the public cauſe," ſaid Lord Chatham to Mr. Flood, in a private converſation, as he told me, on the civil war between Charles I. and his people. "There was," ſaid he, "ambition; there was ſedition; there was violence; but no "man will perſuade me, that it was not the cauſe of liberty "on one ſide, and tyranny on the other." So here there may be conſpiracy; there may be republicaniſm; there may be a ſpirit of plunder mixing in the public cauſe; but it is a public cauſe; and let no man perſuade you that it is not the cauſe of liberty on one ſide, and tyranny on the other. The Hiſtorian of theſe melancholy and alarming times, cenſuring, perhaps, both the Miniſter and the Oppoſition, and cenſuring us more for our relaxation than violence, will, if a candid man, cloſe the ſad account by obſerving, "that, on "the whole, the cauſe of the Iriſh diſtraction of 97, was "the conduct of the ſervants of Government, endeavouring "to eſtabliſh, by unlimited bribery, abſolute power; that

"the

" the ſyſtem of coercion was a neceſſary conſequence, and " part of the ſyſtem of corruption; and that the two ſyſtems, " in their ſucceſs, would have eſtabliſhed a ruthleſs and hor- " rid tyranny, tremendous, and intolerable! impoſed on " the Senate by influence, and the People by arms."—— Againſt ſuch exceſs of degradation; againſt any exceſs whatſoever, we moved the middle, and, as we thought, the compoſing and the ſalutary meaſure; a Reform of Parliament, which ſhould give a Conſtitution to the People, and the Catholic Emancipation, which ſhould give a People to the Conſtitution. We ſupported that meaſure by the arguments herein advanced; and we defended ourſelves by ſuch, againſt a deluge of abuſe, conveyed in the public prints againſt us, on account of that meaſure; and I re-ſtate thoſe arguments, that, however the majority of the Houſe of Commons might have been affected, your underſtanding may not be carried away by ſuch a torrent of invective.—We urged thoſe conſiderations, we might have added in our defence the dangers of invaſion, and inſurrection, panics moſt likely to incline the Miniſter to concur in ſuch a meaſure, which meaſure ſeems to be our beſt, I might ſay our only defence againſt thoſe dangers and thoſe panics; we might have added conſiderations of the immenſe expence attendant on the working, as it is called, of this Borough Conſtitution: which expence may be called the prodigality of miſrepreſentation, or the huge and gigantic profuſion which the people ſupply for turning themſelves out of Parliament. It is well known that the price of boroughs is from 14 to 16,000l. and has in the courſe of not many years increaſed one-third; a proof at once of the extravagance and audacity of this abuſe, which thus looks to immortality, and proceeds, unawed by the times and uninſtructed by example; and, in moments which are held alarming, entertains no fear, conceives no panic, and feels no remorſe, which prevents the chapman, and dealer, to go on at any riſque with his villainous little barter, in the very rockings and frownings of the elements,

and

and makes him tremble indeed at liberty, but not at crimes. "Suſpend the habeas corpus act, take away the poor man, "ſend the reformer to Newgate, impriſon the North; but "for the trade of Parliament, for the borough-broker of that "trade, don't affect him; give him a gun-powder act, give "him a convention bill, give him an inſurrection bill, give "him an indemnity bill; and, having ſaturated him with "the liberty of his country, give him all the plunder of the "ſtate." Such is the practical language of that great Noun of Multitude, the borough-broker, demurring on the troubles of the times, which he himſelf has principally cauſed, and lying at the door of a ſecretary full of ſores and exactions. This ſum I ſpeak of, this 14 or 16,000l. muſt ultimately be paid by you: it is this increaſe of the price of boroughs which has produced the increaſe of the expence of your eſtabliſhment, and this increaſe of the expence of your eſtabliſhment, which has produced this increaſe for the price of your boroughs; they operate alternately like cauſe and effect, and have within themſelves the double principle of rapid ruin; ſo that the people pay their members as formerly, but pay them more, and pay them for repreſenting others, not themſelves, and giving the public purſe, full and open, to the Miniſter, and rendering it back empty to the people. Oh, unthrifty People! whoever ſurrendered that invaluable right of paying your own repreſentatives, rely on it, the people muſt be the prey if they are not the paymaſters. To this public expence we are to add the monſtrous and bankrupt waſte of private property, becoming now ſo great that honeſt men cannot in any number afford to come into Parliament: the expence amounts to a child's portion, and the child muſt be wronged, or the father ſold or excluded. Thus, in the borough conſtitution, is private virtue and public ſet at variance, and men muſt renounce the ſervice of their country or the intereſt of their family; from this evil, the loſs of private fortune, a much greater loſs is likely hereafter to take place, the loſs of talent in the public ſervice: for this great expence muſt in the end

work

work out of Parliament all unſtipendiary talent that acts for the people, and ſupply it by ſtipendiary talent that acts againſt them. What man of ſmall fortune, what man of great fortune can now afford to come into the Houſe of Commons, or ſuſtain the expence of a ſeat in Parliament, or of a conteſted election? and what open place, except in a very few inſtances, (the city is one of them) where the electors return without coſt to their repreſentatives? I know ſome who have great talents and have exerciſed them in the public ſervice, are diſpoſed to decline ſituations, to the honeſt individual ſo expenſive, and to the public now ſo unprofitable. To this I am to add a greater evil than thoſe already ſtated, the expenditure of morals. What ſhall we ſay for the morals of a country; how many years purchaſe would you give for her virtue, whoſe Miniſtry founded its authority on moral depravity, and formed a league and covenant with an oligarchy to transfer for hire, virtually and ſubſtantially, the powers of legiſlation to the Cabinet of another kingdom? We inveigh againſt other combinations—what ſort of a combination is this? This, I know not by what name to approach it, ſhoots its virus into the heart and marrow of the higher orders of the country. Make your People honeſt, ſays the Court—make your Court honeſt, ſay the People; it is the higher claſſes that introduce corruption: thieving may be learned from poverty; but corruption is learned from riches; it is a venal court that makes a venal country; that vice deſcends from above; the peaſant does not go to the caſtle for the bribe, but the caſtle candidate goes to the peaſant; and the caſtle candidate offers the bribe to the peaſant, becauſe he expects in a much greater bribe to be repaid by the Miniſter; thus things go on; 'tis impoſſible they can laſt:—the trade of Parliament ruins every thing; your Miniſters reſted their authority entirely on that trade, till now they call in the aid of military power to enforce corruption by the ſword; the laws did, in my judgment, afford the Crown ſufficient power to adminiſter the country, and preſerve the connexion with

Great Britain; but our Miniſters have deſpiſed the ordinary tract, and plain, obvious, legitimate and vulgar bonds between the King and the ſubject; they have reſorted to the guinea and the gallows, as to the only true and faithful friends of Government, and try to hang where they cannot corrupt; they have extended the venal ſtipendiary principle to all conſtituted authorities; they have given the taint to the grave Corporator as well as the Senator, and have gone into the halls and ſtreets to communicate the evil to the middling and orderly part of the Society: they have attempted the independency of the bar. I have great objections to the bar-bill —and my objections are great in proportion to my regards for the profeſſion, whoſe ſignal ſervices to the cauſe of liberty muſt prove to every man's conviction how valuable the acquiſition, and how ineſtimable the loſs of that profound and acute profeſſion muſt be to the cauſe of a country ſuch as this was formerly, where the rule of government was the law of the land. We have heard of complaints againſt ſyſtems of diſorganization; What is this ſyſtem? Is not the corruption of organized bodies their diſſolution? Is not their perverſion worſe than their diſſolution? What ſhall we ſay of the attempts of Miniſters on Sheriffs, and the appointment of that Magiſtrate with a view to Parliamentary influence only; and to the prevention of legal aggregate meetings; and the ſuppreſſion of the public ſentiment? Theſe things muſt have an end; this diſorganization of conſtituted authorities by court influence muſt have an end. I am not ſuperſtitious; but I know that States, like individuals, are puniſhed; it is to prevent their puniſhment we eſſayed their reformation; they are puniſhed collectively, and they are puniſhed ſlowly, but they are puniſhed: where the people are generally or univerſally corrupt, the ſociety comes to a ſtate of diſſolution; where that corruption is confined to thoſe who adminiſter the country, that power muſt come to a ſtate of diſſolution; but in order to prevent the ſociety from partaking of that corruption and conſequence of that corrupt diſſolution, it is neceſſary that the power that adminiſters the country ſhould

be

be brought ſpeedily and radically to a ſtate of reformation: the beſt ſyſtems are not immortal: Are the worſt? Is the trade of Parliament immortal? Have the beſt ſyſtems periſhed? and ſhall this be impaſſable and everlaſting, infinite in its duration, as it is unbounded in its profligacy? What was the caſe of Carthage; of Rome; and of the court of France? What is the caſe of the court of England? Sitting under the ſtroke of Juſtice for the American war; paying pains and penalties in augmented burdens and diminiſhed glory: that influence which has depreſſed her liberty has deſtroyed her energy, and rendered her as unfit to preſerve her empire as her freedom. As long as the battle was between the Court and the Conſtitution, the former was perfectly equal to ſubdue her own people; but when ſhe was to combat another people, ſhe was unequal to the taſk; and for the very reaſon, becauſe ſhe had ſeduced and debaſed her own. The corruption of the Court has rendered England vincible, and has endued her, in her preſent ſtate of national degradation, with an inſenſibility of glory; the reſult and evidence of mental degeneracy. I remember to have heard Lord Chatham, in one of his ſpeeches on the Middleſex election, obſerve, that in his miniſtry the object of the Court of England was the conqueſt of the French; and that now it was the conqueſt of Mr. Wilkes. The purſuing ſuch-like conqueſts as thoſe over Mr. Wilkes, has enabled the French to eſtabliſh a conqueſt over the Engliſh. The King, who is adviſed to conquer the liberty of his ſubjects, prepares thoſe ſubjects for a foreign yoke. The Romans were conquered at Cannæ, firſt by Varro, and afterwards by Hannibal: the Engliſh have been conquered, firſt by the Miniſter, and afterwards by the French. Thoſe Romans were finally conquered by the barbarians of the North, becauſe they had been previouſly conquered by the Princes of the Empire; and then the half-armed ſavage, with the pike and the pole, came down on the frontiers, and diſpoſed of the maſters of the world as of the ſtock of the land; the gouty ſtock of the rich, and the mute ſtock of the People.

It

It is now ſixty years ſince the adoption of the project to ſupply in corruption what the Chief magiſtrate loſt in prerogative; the loſs of thirteen provinces; of 130,000,000l.—to loſe theſe provinces, the loſs of our ſtation in Europe, the loſs of 130 millions, to loſe that ſtation; to place the crown of England as low in Europe as in America; and to put France at the head of Europe inſtead of Great Britain, while her people crouch under a load of debt and taxes, without an empire to conſole, or a conſtitution to cover them, has been the working of that project; it has worked ſo well as to have worked the people out of their liberty, and his Majeſty out of his empire; to leave him as little authority in Europe, as his people in parliament; and to put the King at the feet of France, as the people are put at the feet of the King: public credit has alſo fallen a victim to this its ſucceſs, its laſt great conqueſt after liberty and empire. In this rapid decline no one Miniſter has been puniſhed or even queſtioned; and an empire and a conſtitution have been loſt without one penal example; and in a war unparalleled in expence and diſgrace, and attended with the groſſeſt and rankeſt errors, cloſing the account of blood with proclamations of inſolvency—no murmur from the Parliament of either countries—no murmur! Far from enquiry or complaint, confidence has uniformly attended defeat and diſhonour. The Miniſter's majorities are become as numerous as his diſgraces, and ſo gigantic have been his encroachments on the independency of the Conſtitution, that they can only be matched by the gigantic encroachment of the enemy on the empire. In ſhort, ſo perfectly do the people appear to be driven out of all footing in the Conſtitution, that when his Majeſty is driven out of almoſt all footing in Europe, and a queſtion is made by the people, Whether the Miniſter of theſe diſgraces and diſhonours ſhall be diſmiſſed? they have their majority at hand to ſupport them. Againſt this inundation of evil we interpoſed Reform; we were convinced of its neceſſity from the conſideration of corruption at home; we were confirmed in that conviction from the conſideration of revolutions

revolutions abroad. We ſaw the regal power of France deſtroyed by debts, by expence, and by abuſes; we ſaw the Nobility interpoſe for thoſe abuſes only to encumber the Throne with their ruins, and to add revolution of property to revolution of government; we ſaw in the American revolution that a people determined to be free cannot be enſlaved; that Britiſh government was not equal to the taſk, even in plenitude of empire, ſupported by the different governments of the provinces, and by the ſad apoſtacy of the hapleſs loyaliſt; that loyaliſt is a leſſon to the rich and great to ſtand by their country in all ſituations; and that in a conteſt with a remote Court, the firſt poſt of ſafety is to ſtand by the country, and the ſecond poſt of ſafety is to ſtand by the country, and the third poſt of ſafety is to ſtand by the country; in that American conteſt we ſaw that Reform, which had been born in England and baniſhed to America, advanced like the Shepherd Lad in Holy Writ, and overthrew Goliath. He returned riding on the waves of the Atlantic, and his ſpirit moved on the waters of Europe. The royal ſhip of France went down—the Britiſh man of war labours—your veſſel is affected—throw your people over-board, ſay your Miniſters, and ballaſt with your abuſes—throw your abuſes over-board, we ſaid, and ballaſt with your people. We recollect theſe iſlands were formerly placed in a ſea of deſpotiſm—we ſaw they were now two kingdoms in a republican ocean, ſituated between two great revolutions, with a certainty of being influenced more or leſs by one or by both. We aſked ourſelves, If it was poſſible that the American revolution could have had ſuch effect on France, and that the American and French revolutions would have no effect on theſe countries? The queſtions that affect the world are decided on the theatre of the world. The great queſtion of popular liberty was fought on the great rivers of Europe and America—it remained to moderate what we could not govern—and what method ſo ſafe to moderate popular power as by limited Monarchy?

And

And what method remains to limit the Monarchy of theſe kingdoms (it has now no limits) as by reforming Parliament? What method I ſay to prevent a Revolution but a Reformation?—and what is that Reformation of Parliament but the reſtoration to the people of Self-legiſlation?—without which there is no liberty, as without Reform no Self-legiſlation. So we reaſoned. The government of a country may be placed in the hands of one man, and that one man may reſide in another kingdom, and yet the people may be free and ſatisfied; but to have the Legiſlature of the country, or what is the ſame thing, the influencing and directing ſpirit of the Legiſlature placed out of the country, to have not only the King but the Legiſlature an abſentee—to have not only the head but the heart diſpoſed of in another country, ſuch a condition may be a diſguiſed, but it is unqualified and perfect deſpotiſm. Self-legiſlation is life, and has been fought for, as for being. It was that principle that called forth reſiſtance to the Houſe of Stuart, and baptized with royalty the Houſe of Hanover, when the people ſtood Sponſors for their allegiance to the liberty of the ſubjects; for Kings are but ſatellites, and your freedom is the luminary that has called them to the ſkies. It was with a view therefore to reſtore liberty, and with a view alſo to ſecure and immortalize Royalty, by reſtoring to the people ſelf-legiſlation, we propoſed Reform. A principle of attraction about which the King and people would ſpin on quietly and inſenſibly in regular movements, and in a ſyſtem common to them both. "No—no,—no,—the half million, ſaid the Miniſter, that "is my principle of attraction. Among the rich I ſend my "half million, and I diſpatch my coercion among the peo-"ple." His Devil went forth; he deſtroyed Liberty and Property—He conſumed the Preſs; he burned houſes and villages; he murdered, and he failed. "Recal your mur-"derer, we ſaid; and, in his place, diſpatch our meſſenger; "try conciliation. You have declared you wiſh the People "to rebel; to which we anſwer, God forbid! Rather let "them

" them weary the royal ear with petitions, and let the dove " be again ſent to the King; it may bring back the olive: " and as to you, you mad Miniſters! who pour in regi- " ment after regiment, to dragoon the Iriſh, becauſe you " have forfeited their affections; we beſeech, we ſupplicate, " we admoniſh, reconcile the People; combat revolution by " reform, let blood be your laſt experiment." Combat the ſpirit of Democracy by the ſpirit of Liberty, the wild ſpirit of Democratic Liberty by the regulated ſpirit of Organized Liberty, ſuch as may be found in a limited Monarchy, with a free Parliament; but how accompliſh that, but by reforming the preſent Parliament, whoſe narrow and contracted formation, in both countries, excludes popular repreſentation; *i. e.* excludes ſelf-legiſlation; *i. e.* excludes liberty; and whoſe fatal compliances, the reſult of that defective repreſentation, have cauſed, or countenanced, or ſanctioned, or ſuffered, for a courſe of years, a ſucceſſion of meaſures, which have collected upon us ſuch an accumulation of calamity; and which have finally, at an immenſe expence, and through a ſea of blood, ſtranded theſe kingdoms on a ſolitary ſhore; naked of empire, naked of liberty, and naked of innocence; to ponder on an abyſs, which has ſwallowed up one part of their fortunes, and yawns for the remainder.

" May the Kingly power, that forms one eſtate in our Conſtitution, continue for ever! but let it be as it profeſſes to be, and as, by the principles and laws of theſe countries, it ſhould be, one eſtate only; and not a power conſtituting one eſtate, creating another, and influencing a third.

" May the Parliamentary Conſtitution proſper! but let it be an operative, independent, and integral part of the Conſtitution; adviſing, confining, and ſometimes directing the Kingly power.

" May the Houſe of Commons flouriſh! but let the People be the ſole author of its exiſtence, as they ſhould be the great object of its care.

" May

" May the connexion with Great Britain continue! but let the reſult of the connexion be—the perfect freedom, in the faireſt and fulleſt ſenſe, of all deſcriptions of men, without diſtinction of religion."

To this purpoſe we ſpoke, and ſpeaking this to no purpoſe, withdrew. It now remains to add this ſupplication: ——However it may pleaſe the ALMIGHTY to diſpoſe of Princes, or of Parliaments; MAY THE LIBERTIES OF THE PEOPLE BE IMMORTAL!

HENRY GRATTAN.

DUBLIN, Auguſt 7th, 1798.

The following EPISTLE being much ſought after, it is now given to ſatisfy the public curioſity:

MR. GRATTAN has ſeen a very groſs, a very unprovoked, and a very ludicrous performance written againſt him and ſigned Patrick Duigenan: Mr. Grattan does not explain his conduct to individuals; the Statute Book and the Journals of the Houſe of Commons are open. Were he to make his public conduct a ſubject of explanation, it would not be to ſuch a perſon as Doctor Duigenan; but as the above-mentioned attack mixes in its folly much perſonal rudeneſs, Mr. Grattan judges it not wholly beneath him to take ſome ſort of notice of it; and he is very ſorry to be forced to obſerve, that the author has departed from the Manners and Language of a Gentleman, and has thought proper to adopt a ſtrain ſo falſe, ſo vile, and ſo diſguſting, as to render Mr. Duigenan a Public Buffoon, too low and ludicrous to give an affront or make an apology.

P. S. Mr. Grattan remains in Dublin for three days, and is to be heard of at Kearns's Hotel, Kildare-ſtreet.

Extract

Extract from the Report of the Secret Committee of the Houſe of Lords.

FRIDAY, AUG. 3, 1798.

John Hughes, of Belfaſt, ſworn.

WHILST he was in Dublin, in April, he dined with Neilſon at the Brazen-Head.—Next day Neilſon called him up at five o'clock, and they went to Sweetman's, near Judge Chamberlaine's, to breakfaſt; Sweetman was then in priſon, but Neilſon lived in his Houſe.—Neilſon took Sweetman's carriage to Mr. Grattan's, and brought him along with him.—When they got to Mr. Grattan's, Neilſon told him he had ſomething to ſay to Mr. Grattan in private, and deſired him to take a walk in the domain.—Neilſon however introduced him to Mr. Grattan firſt; and Mr. Grattan ordered a ſervant to attend him to ſhow him the grounds.—He returned in about half an hour.—Went into Mr. Grattan's library—Neilſon and Grattan were there together—Grattan aſked a variety of queſtions touching the ſtate of the country in the North; how many families had been driven out, and how many houſes burned by the government or the Orange Men?—Grattan ſaid, he ſuppoſed he was an United Iriſhman; he ſaid he was.—Grattan aſked him how many United Iriſhmen were in the province? he ſaid he reckoned 126,000.—Grattan aſked how many Orange men there were? he ſaid about 12,000—Grattan made no particular anſwer.—Neilſon and he left Grattan's about twelve in the day; they walked to their carriage which was at Enniſkerry; he aſked Neilſon what had paſſed between Grattan and him.—Neilſon evaded the queſtion, ſaid generally, that he had gone to Grattan to aſk him whether he would come forward, and that he had ſworn him.—That Grattan promiſed to meet him in Dublin before the next Tueſday.

Q. You have ſaid that you were introduced to Mr. Grattan by Samuel Neilſon at his houſe at Tinnehinch, in

April laſt—Recollect yourſelf, and ſay whether you can ſpeak with certainty as to that fact?

A. I certainly can—About the 28th of April laſt, I went to Mr. Grattan's at Tinnehinch with Samuel Neilſon; on going into the houſe we were ſhewed into the library.—Neilſon introduced me to Mr. Grattan, and I ſoon after walked out, and left them alone for full half an hour.—I ſaw a printed Conſtitution of the United Iriſhmen in the room.

Q. Can you ſay whether Mr. Grattan knew it to be the Conſtitution of United Iriſhmen?

A. I can—for he aſked me ſome queſtions about it—He aſked me alſo a variety of queſtions about the ſtate of the North—When we were going away, I heard Mr. Grattan tell Neilſon he would be in town on or before the Tueſday following;—and I underſtood from Neilſon that Mr. Grattan had viſited him in priſon; and on our return to town, Neilſon told me he had ſworn Mr. Grattan.

Neilſon and I breakfaſted that morning at the country-houſe of Sweetman, who was then in priſon, and went from thence to Mr. Grattan's in Sweetman's carriage.

THURSDAY, AUG. 9th, 1798.

Samuel Neilſon of Belfaſt, ſworn.

Q. Have you had any interviews with Mr. Grattan ſince you were liberated from confinement?

A. I was twice with Mr. Grattan at Tinnehinch, in April 1798.—I either ſhewed Mr. Grattan the laſt Conſtitution of the Society of United Iriſhmen, or explained it to him, and preſſed him to come forward—I was accompanied at theſe interviews by John Sweetman and Oliver Bond.

By a letter addreſſed to the Lord Chancellor, by Samuel Neilſon, immediately after his examination, he wiſhes to correct his evidence, by ſtating, that he had another interview with Mr. Grattan at Tinnehinch, in company with Mr. John Hughes, and that they both went there in Mr. Sweetman's chaiſe.

FINIS.

PART II.

A

FAIR REPRESENTATION

OF

THE POLITICAL STATE

OF

IRELAND;

IN A COURSE OF STRICTURES ON TWO PAMPHLETS,

ONE ENTITLED

'THE CASE OF IRELAND RE-CONSIDERED;'

THE OTHER ENTITLED

'CONSIDERATIONS ON THE STATE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS IN THE YEAR 1799,—IRELAND;'

WITH

Obſervations on other modern Publications on the Subject of

AN INCORPORATING UNION OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND,

Particularly on a Pamphlet entitled

'THE SPEECH OF LORD MINTO IN THE HOUSE OF PEERS, APRIL 11, 1799.'

By PATRICK DUIGENAN, L. L. D.

CONTENTS.

Page

STRICTURES on a Pamphlet entitled 'The Case of 'Ireland Re-considered' — — — 9

Observations on a Pamphlet entitled 'Arguments for 'and against an Union considered' — — 94

Continuation of the Strictures on the 'Case of Ireland 'Re-considered' — — — — 103

Strictures on a Pamphlet entitled 'Considerations on the 'State of Public Affairs in the Year 1799 *—Ireland'* 138

Observations on a Pamphlet entitled 'The Speech of 'Lord Minto in the House of Lords, April 11, 1799' 174

Observations on a Pamphlet entitled 'Substance of the 'Speech of Lord Sheffield, April 22, 1799' — 207

Observations on a Pamphlet entitled 'The Speech of the 'Right Honourable William Pitt' — — 211

APPENDIX.

Calculation of the Number of Inhabitants in Ireland 235

Relative Numbers of Protestants and Romanists in Ireland — — — — 240

Comparative Property of Irish Protestants and Romanists 242

A FAIR

A

FAIR REPRESENTATION

OF THE

PRESENT POLITICAL STATE

OF

IRELAND.

AN Incorporating Union of Great Britain and Ireland is a Meaſure, the magnitude and importance of which have not only engaged the moſt ſerious conſideration of the ſubjects of the Britiſh Empire, but have attracted the attention of many of the other ſtates of Europe, as well friends as enemies.

Although I have been for many years the avowed friend of the meaſure, and in the year 1793 declared in the Iriſh Houſe of Commons my ſettled opinion on the ſubject, and was then the only man who did ſo, ſtating at the ſame time ſome of the reaſons on which my opinion was founded; and although I have, by the occurrences of every day ſince, been more and more confirmed in my ſentiments upon it, and convinced not only of the expediency, but of the neceſſity of the meaſure; yet I do not mean to trouble my readers with any arguments on the ſubject:

my deſign in the preſent publication is, to expoſe the baſe falſehoods and malignant miſrepreſentations of the State of Ireland, contained in ſome pamphlets which have lately appeared, profeſſedly written on the ſubject of the Union, but in truth for a very different purpoſe; and to add a few obſervations on other pamphlets publiſhed in England, as the ſubſtance of Speeches ſpoken in the Britiſh Houſes of Parliament, on the ſubject of an Incorporating Union, by men in the higheſt ſtations in Britain; from which it would ſeem, that theſe great men entertained very erroneous ideas of the Preſent State of Ireland, and of the Strength, Views, and Intereſts of the different claſſes of its inhabitants: and I am not without hope that I may, by fair and honeſt repreſentations, conduce to the ſucceſs of a meaſure, which has for many years been the object of all my feeble exertions in the political world.

In England the project of an Incorporating Union of Great Britain and Ireland has been entertained with an almoſt univerſal approbation; the good ſenſe of the nation has clearly pointed out to every honeſt mind, the manifeſt advantages to the Britiſh Empire in general of ſuch a meaſure; it has been there oppoſed only by a handful of Jacobins. In Ireland the caſe is different; it has been there oppoſed by many men of great loyalty, abilities, and rank, and has given riſe to much diſcontent and diſſenſion among perſons of the firſt political influence. It is remarkable, however, in Ireland, that all traitors and Jacobins are unanimous in their reprobation of the meaſure, while the well-affected are divided in their opinions, ſome (I think the majority) approving, and others diſapproving of it. Perhaps I may be in ſome meaſure able in the concluſion to account for this difference of opinion

among the Iriſh Loyaliſts; at preſent, however, it is ſufficient to remark, that their diſſenſion has given an advantage to the Jacobins which they have eagerly availed themſelves of. All their conſpiracies detected, their falſe treaſonable libels expoſed and confuted, their rebellion ſuppreſſed, their French allies chaſed out of the ocean, they lay grovelling on the earth, diſabled, diſmayed, and dejected, till the heat of this conteſt between their conquerors on the ſubject of the Union again vivified them, as the heat of the ſun does the inſects on a dunghill; again the buzz of theſe hornets was heard in every part of the nation; and of all their neſts, Popery ſent forth the buſieſt and moſt numerous ſwarms.

A claſs of writers of that perſuaſion have of late been indefatigable both in England and Ireland, in publiſhing the moſt audacious falſehoods reſpecting Iriſh Proteſtants, their religious and political conduct, principles, numbers, ſtrength, and influence; nor are their falſehoods leſs daring and notorious reſpecting the ſame qualities in the Iriſh Romaniſts, debaſing and vilifying the firſt claſs, and magnifying the laſt, with the moſt ſingular contempt of truth. No artifice of malignant miſrepreſentation, of ſlander, of degradation on the one ſide, or of applauſe, celebration, aggrandizement, and exaggeration on the other, has been omitted.

Theſe writers never entertained the leaſt hope that their calumnies would gain any credit in Ireland; their falſehood was too notorious there: they publiſhed them for the meridian of England, where the ignorance of the bulk of the nation of the real ſtate of Ireland might cauſe a temporary belief of fictions ſo boldly and ſo impudently

ſtated: this temporary belief in the preſent criſis they knew they could turn to the advantage of the political purſuits of their ſect; becauſe it would naturally incline the leading men in the Britiſh Adminiſtration to favour their ruinous claims in the negotiation of an Union of the two nations, and enable the Iriſh Romaniſts to obtain a ſupport in the treaty for pretenſions radically inimical to every Proteſtant government, but more particularly ſo, where part of the ſovereignty is a popular aſſembly; and this treaty might be brought to a concluſion before the Britiſh nation ſhould be apprized on what a rotten foundation their pretenſions were erected.

The degradation and abuſe of the Iriſh Proteſtants by theſe Romiſh writers, and vaunts of the ſtrength and importance of their own ſect, were particularly adapted to alienate the minds of the Britiſh Proteſtants from their brethren in Ireland, and to induce them to acquieſce, perhaps to aſſiſt, in the ſubverſion of the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment in that kingdom, which if they can once effect, they very juſtly conſider that the ſcheme of the Separation of the two countries will be more than half accompliſhed, though a treaty for an Union ſhall be concluded: the Proteſtants of Ireland, as the Romaniſts well know, compoſing the principal links of the chain of connexion between the two nations.

I ſhould have left theſe malicious Romiſh fables to merited contempt and oblivion, nor would I have condeſcended to have taken the ſlighteſt notice of them, had I not perceived, from reading the ſubſtance of certain Speeches of very eminent perſonages, delivered in the Britiſh Houſes of Lords and Commons, lately publiſhed on the

the ſubject of Union, that the groſs falſehoods and miſrepreſentations of theſe Romiſh writers had been adopted by theſe great men, and that they had been ſo far duped by them, as to repeat them in the Britiſh Senate, and to reaſon upon them, as if they had been facts; grounding ſome of their arguments in favour of an Union on ſuch deceitful phantoms conjured up by theſe magicians of fraud and malice, and deſerting the powerful, convincing, and irrefragable arguments for an Incorporating Union, grounded on the ſituation and preſent connexion of the two iſlands, the ſtate of Europe in general, and the manifeſt benefits which muſt neceſſarily accrue to each iſland in particular, and to the Britiſh empire in general, from ſuch an Union; and thereby raiſing in the breaſts of all the Proteſtants of that empire, the faithful ſubjects of his Majeſty, the moſt alarming apprehenſions of innovation in their conſtitution both in church and ſtate, and rendering Iriſh Proteſtants particularly, in whom is for the preſent veſted, excluſively, the whole political power of that kingdom, diſinclined to an Union, by giving them cauſe to ſuſpect that ſuch an Union is projected ſolely for the depreſſion of their religion in Ireland, and the elevation of Popery on its ruins.

Two of theſe pamphlets, manifeſtly the productions of Romiſh writers, though they have concealed their names, I ſhall particularly notice, becauſe they contain a general collection of all the falſehood and miſrepreſentation reſpecting the ſtate of Ireland, the numbers, phyſical and political ſtrength, the influence, principles, and deſigns of the different claſſes of its inhabitants, which have been publiſhed in all the pamphlets, magazines, reviews, annual regiſters, newſpapers, &c. by Romiſh writers and their allies, the Infidels, Republicans, and Jacobins, from

the time Mr. Edmund Burke, the modern apoſtle of Popery, began his operations for the ſubverſion of the Proteſtant religion in Ireland, to the preſent day. One of theſe pamphlets is entitled, '*The Caſe of Ireland Re-conſidered, in Anſwer to a Pamphlet entitled, "Arguments for and againſt an Union conſidered.*" The other is entitled, '*Conſiderations on the State of Public Affairs in the Year 1799—Ireland.*' The author of the firſt of theſe performances pretends to argue againſt the Union of the two kingdoms; the author of the ſecond, to ſupport it with the utmoſt zeal; but the real purpoſe of both is, to degrade, vilify, and traduce the Proteſtant, and magnify aggrandize, and elevate the Romiſh inhabitants of Ireland, by every ſpecies of falſehood, miſrepreſentation, and malice.

The reputed author of the firſt is a Romiſh gentleman of a competent landed eſtate in Ireland,——

I have

I have ſtated this gentleman to be a Romaniſt; indeed he ſtates himſelf, in p. 58 of his pamphlet, to be ſo; and I may be perhaps accuſed of inconſiſtency in ſuppoſing any man, inſtituted as he has been, to be a Romaniſt, which implies his being a Chriſtian: to clear myſelf of any imputation of that kind, it is neceſſary that I ſhould briefly explain my meaning, which I cannot do better than by nearly copying part of Swift's character of the Earl (afterwards Duke) of Wharton, in his Hiſtory of the Four laſt Years of Queen Ann: he there obſerves, that the Earl's father was a rigid Preſbyterian, that the Earl adopted his father's principles in government, but dropt his religion, and took up no other in its room, but that in all other reſpects he was a firm Preſbyterian. Now the gentleman's father I am writing of was a rigid Romaniſt; he dropt his father's religion, and took up no other in its room, but in all other reſpects he is a firm Romaniſt. And ſuch a character is not ſingular; I have waſted ſome attention on ſeveral perſons bred Romaniſts, who have conformed to the Proteſtant religion, and who have attained honourable, confidential, and lucrative appointments by their conformity; and on others bred in that perſuaſion, who both in theory and practice have profeſſed Deiſm; and ſcarce ever knew one of them, who, in all political purſuits of that ſect, did not prove himſelf to be a firm Romaniſt: ſome of them, in whoſe breaſts a few half-ſmothered ſparks of Chriſtianity ſtill glimmered,

glimmered, have had them kindled into a ſort of lambent flame of devotion by the unequivocal ſymptoms of approaching death, and they have uniformly died in the Romiſh perſuaſion.

The author of the ſecond pamphlet I have mentioned is not aſcertained; many have been the candidates, proclaimed by the poſterior trumpet of Fame, for the eminent turpitude of being the parent of this deteſtable production. The author of the firſt endeavours to conceal the natural deformity of falſehood and malice, by clothing them in ſomething of a gentlemanly garb; the author of the ſecond aggravates that natural deformity, by arraying them in all the ſhaggy horrors of the ſavage: his unrelenting malignant abuſe of Iriſh Proteſtants, from the beginning to the end of his performance, ſufficiently demonſtrates his political creed at leaſt to be the ſame with that of the author of the firſt pamphlet. But I have perhaps detained the reader too long by perſonal remarks on theſe two authors; I will therefore now proceed to examine the contents of their pamphlets.

Commencement of the Strictures on the pamphlet entitled, 'The Caſe of Ireland re-conſidered.'

The author of the firſt grounds all his arguments, for advancing Iriſh Romaniſts to an equality of political power in the Britiſh empire in general with their Proteſtant fellow-ſubjects, on two poſitions. The firſt and principal is, *that men ſincerely attached to the whole Romiſh creed may be as good and faithful ſubjects of the Britiſh empire as Proteſtants.* The ſecond is, *that property by the Britiſh Conſtitution entitles the poſſeſſors to political power in proportion to the property, and that it is therefore unconſtitutional to exclude Romaniſts from a ſhare of political power in the ſtate proportioned to their property.* Theſe are the two

grand

grand pillars on which he propoſes to rebuild the gaudy palace of Romiſh tyranny and uſurpation in the Britiſh empire, at the ſame time not neglecting to prop it with numberleſs buttreſſes of menaces, ſlanders, malice, falſehood, ſophiſtry, and deceit.

His argument on the firſt of theſe propoſitions he introduces in the following modeſt manner:

'The next is a very old objection, *which I never could* 'underſtand how any well-informed man could make twice.

'The moſt numerous religious ſect (i. e. Romaniſts) 'does not acknowledge the ſupremacy of the ſtate, but 'profeſſes to be ſubject to a foreign juriſdiction. Their 'religion could not be eſtabliſhed without deſtroying the 'conſtitution, which is founded on the principles of 'civil and eccleſiaſtical liberty, and the excluſion of fo-'reign interference and juriſdiction.'

After thus ſtating the objection, and with no ſmall degree of petulance obſerving that no well-informed man could ſupport it, or urge it twice, he argues thus: 'This may 'be an objection to their having a religious eſtabliſh-'ment, but not to their being admitted to a ſhare in the 'Legiſlature, the King and Peers being Proteſtants, and '(property being the baſis of repreſentation) nine-tenths 'of the Houſe of Commons. *Romaniſts do not deny the* 'ſole right of the ſtate to manage the concerns, eſtabliſhment, 'faith, and diſcipline of the Church of England; but they 'do not admit the King of England to be ſpiritual head 'of the Roman Catholic Church, *nor do the Preſbyterians* 'admit him to be the head of theirs. This was not a rea-

'ſon

'ſon for excluding the Scotch from a ſhare in the legiſ-
'lature of the country they were united to; why ſhould
'it exclude the Iriſh? The ſpiritual authority which
'the Romiſh Church poſſeſſes has no ſanction, no co-
'ercive power in this life, and can in no way come in
'contact with civil exiſtence. *The Pope nominates the*
'*Iriſh Romiſh biſhops*, but this gives him no real or eſſen-
'tial juriſdiction in the Iriſh ſtate; he and the whole
'Roman Catholic Church have not in the Iriſh ſtate,
'nor pretend to have, the power of the meaneſt veſtry.
'Cujas, a French lawyer, and Cardinal Fleury, have
'declared, that the Pope, nor the whole Church to-
'gether, cannot inflict any coercive puniſhment on any
'man, whatſoever his crimes may be, unleſs the Em-
'peror gives him power to do it. The power which
'*Popes have been accuſed of arrogating* over the princes of
'Europe was entirely foreign to their ſpiritual authority,
'and to the Roman Catholic religion. In no country in
'the world can any tribunal exiſt deriving from the
'Roman Catholic religion, or any ſentence be enforced
'affecting a man in any way whatſoever in his liberty,
'life, property, or any part of his civil or natural ex-
'iſtence, without the permiſſion of the Sovereign of
'that country: ſuch is the doctrine of Spain, Portugal,
'and all the Roman Catholic countries in the world.
'Magna Charta, the foundation of civil liberty, as well
'as the Statutes of Præmunire, which ſecured eccleſiaſ-
'tical liberty, were acts of Roman Catholic Parlia-
'ments. If a foreign juriſdiction exiſt, to that con-
'ſent, and not to the Roman Catholic religion, of
'which it is no *inherent* part, are the inconveniencies of it
'to be aſcribed.' All this the author concludes with an appoſite and moſt delightful alluſion, purloined from Monſieur

Monſieur Voltaire, with a trifling alteration; to wit, 'Philoſophy enters as much into the common concerns 'of life as divinity. It would be a ſtrange objection 'to 'the ſyſtem of Ariſtotle or Copernicus, that it was a 'foreign interference.' Bravo!

Before I proceed to the expoſure of this diffuſive kind of argument, partly falſe and partly ſophiſtical, it will be neceſſary to inſert here the *Oath of Supremacy*, which all Romaniſts abſolutely refuſe to take, and have done ſo ſince the firſt framing of it; and alſo an Extract from the Decrees of a general Council, the deciſions of which all Romaniſts now hold as articles of faith, immutable and irreverſible, not being the decrees of Popes, but of their univerſal church; the Oath taken by Romiſh Biſhops at their conſecration: and I ſhall alſo add a few extracts from the recent publications of their moſt authentic writers reſpecting the preſent immutable Articles of the Romiſh Creed.

The Oath of Supremacy is as follows:

'I —— do ſwear, that I do from my heart abhor, 'deteſt, and abjure, as impious and heretical, that damn-'able doctrine and poſition, that Princes excommuni-'cated or deprived by the Pope, or any authority of the 'See of Rome, may be depoſed or murdered by their 'ſubjects, or by any other perſon whatſoever: and I do 'declare, that no foreign Prince, Prelate, State, or Po-'tentate, hath, or ought to have, any juriſdiction, power, 'ſuperiority, pre-eminence, or authority, eccleſiaſtical or 'ſpiritual, within this realm. So help me God.'

Extract

Extract from the third Chapter of the fourth Council of Lateran, held under Pope Innocent III. in 1215, *tranſlated into Engliſh.*

'We excommunicate and anathematize all hereſy, 'raiſing itſelf up againſt the holy, orthodox, catholic 'faith, which we have above ſet forth, condemning all 'heretics, of whatſoever titles, having divers faces, but 'connected and knitted together by their tails; for in 'reſpect to the vanity of their pretenſions they agree in 'the ſame thing.

'We leave the condemned to *condign puniſhment* by 'the preſent ſecular powers or their magiſtrates, ſuch of 'them as are clergymen being firſt degraded: the 'goods of ſuch of them as are laics being *confiſcated*; 'of ſuch as are clergymen, applied to the uſe of the 'churches of their reſpective cures.

'But we decree, that ſuch as are only ſuſpected of 'hereſy be ſtruck with the ſword of excommunication, 'till they ſhall prove their innocence reſpectively, ac- 'cording to the nature of the ſuſpicion and the quality 'of each perſon, by a proper purgation; and let them 'be avoided by all perſons till they ſhall make ſufficient 'ſatisfaction: and if they ſhall continue excommuni- 'cated for the ſpace of one year, let them be conſidered 'as condemned heretics.

'Let all ſecular powers, whatſoever be the nature 'and rank of their reſpective offices, be admoniſhed, 'perſuaded, and, if neceſſary, *compelled*, by eccleſiaſtical 'cenſures, that as they deſire to be reputed and eſteemed

'faithful,

' faithful, they publicly take an oath, that they will, to ' the utmoſt of their power, endeavour *to exterminate* all ' ſuch as ſhall be denounced heretics by the church, out ' of all their dominions and places ſubject to their juriſ- ' diction; and let them take this oath reſpectively, the ' moment they ſhall be inveſted with either ſpiritual or ' temporal power.

' But if any temporal Lord ſhall neglect to purge his ' dominions of ſuch heretical corruption, after being ' required and admoniſhed by the Church, by his Me- ' tropolitans and his other provincial Biſhops ſo to do, ' *let him be immediately bound in the chains of excommuni-* ' *cation;* and if he ſhall contumaciouſly refuſe to make ' ſatisfaction and ſubmit himſelf to the Church within ' the year, *let this be ſignified to the Pope, who ſhall there-* ' *upon declare his ſubjects abſolved from their allegiance, and* ' *proclaim his territories open to the juſt ſeizure and occu-* ' *pation of Catholic Powers, who, after they ſhall have ex-* ' *terminated the heretics, ſhall poſſeſs them without control,* ' *and preſerve them in the purity of the faith, ſtill preſerv-* ' *ing the title of the principal Lord, provided he ſhall give* ' *them no interruption, or oppoſe any impediment to their* ' *proceedings*; and let the ſame rule be obſerved with ' reſpect to thoſe who have no principal lords, *i. e.* ' republics.

' Let all Catholics who ſhall undertake a *cruſade* for ' the extermination of heretics have the ſame indulgence, ' and the ſame holy privilege, as thoſe who undertake ' the cruſade for the expulſion of the infidels from the ' Holy Land.

' We

'We decree, that not only thoſe who profeſs heretical 'tenets, but all receivers, protectors, and favourers of 'heretics, are *ipſo facto* excommunicated; and we 'ſtrictly ordain and command, that after any ſuch ſhall 'be publicly branded with excommunication, if they 'ſhall refuſe to make ſatisfaction and ſubmit themſelves 'to the Church within a year, *they ſhall be infamous, nor 'ſhall they be admitted to any public office or council, nor to 'elect any perſons to ſuch, nor to give teſtimony in any cauſe; 'neither ſhall they be capable of making wills, nor of ſuc-'ceſſion, as heirs or repreſentatives, to any eſtate: they ſhall 'be incapable of ſuing in any court, but may themſelves be 'ſued: if any ſuch perſon ſhall happen to be a judge of any 'court, his ſentence ſhall be null and void, nor ſhall any 'cauſe be proſecuted before him: if he ſhall happen to be an 'advocate, he ſhall not be admitted to practiſe; if a notary, 'inſtruments drawn up, prepared, witneſſed, or executed by 'him, ſhall alſo be void and of no effect, but condemned 'with their guilty framer: and we command that the ſame 'rule be obſerved in all ſimilar caſes.* But if he be a 'clergyman, let him be depoſed both *ab officio et beneficio*, 'that, as his crime is the greater, ſo the greater may 'be his puniſhment.

'And if any ſuch, after they have been publicly de-'nounced by the Church, ſhall contumaciouſly neglect 'to ſubmit and make ſatisfaction, let them be compelled 'and driven to it by the inceſſant operation of the ſen-'tence of excommunication. Let no clergyman admi-'niſter to ſuch peſtilent wretches the ſacraments of the 'Church, nor permit their bodies to Chriſtian burial, 'nor receive their alms and oblations. If they ſhall act 'otherwiſe, let them be ſuſpended from officiating, and

'let

'let them not be reſtored but by the ſpecial indulgence 'of the Pope.

'We alſo add, that every Archbiſhop or Biſhop, by 'himſelf or his archdeacon, or other reſpectable per- 'ſons, ſhall twice, or at leaſt once, in every year, 'viſit each pariſh in his dioceſe, in which it is reported 'that any heretics dwell, and ſhall there oblige three or 'more credible perſons, or, if he ſhall think proper, the 'whole vicinage, to ſwear, that if any of them ſhall 'know any heretics, or any perſons holding or frequent- 'ing ſecret conventicles, or affecting either in life or 'manners to differ from the common converſation and 'practice in life of the faithful, they will endeavour 'effectually to diſcover and point them out to the Biſhop; 'and the Biſhop ſhall call the accuſed into his preſence, 'and if they ſhall not effectually purge themſelves from 'the crimes laid to their charge, or if, after they ſhall 'have made their purgation, they ſhall perfidiouſly re- 'lapſe into their former guilt, they ſhall be canonically 'puniſhed. And if any, through damnable obſtinacy 'declining to bind themſelves by the religious obligation 'of an oath, ſhall perhaps refuſe to ſwear, let them be 'from that inſtant reputed heretics.'

The Oath ſworn by every Romiſh Biſhop at his conſe- cration is as follows. See the firſt vol. of Burnet's Hiſ- tory of the Reformation, p. 123.

'I, ——, Biſhop of ———, do ſwear, that from this 'hour forward I ſhall be faithful and obedient to St. Peter, 'and to the holy Church of Rome, *and to my Lord the Pope* '*and his ſucceſſors canonically entering.* I ſhall not be of 'counſel

'counſel nor conſent that they ſhall loſe either life or 'member, or ſhall be taken or ſuffer any violence or 'any wrong by any means. Their counſel to me cre-'dited by them, their meſſages or letters, I ſhall not 'willingly diſcover to any perſon. The Papacy of 'Rome, the rules of the holy Fathers, and the *regality* 'of St Peter, I ſhall help, maintain, and defend againſt 'all men. The Legate of the See apoſtolic, going and 'coming, I ſhall honourably entreat: the rights, ho-'nours, privileges, and authorities of the Church of 'Rome, and of the Pope and his ſucceſſors, I ſhall 'cauſe to be conſerved, defended, *augmented, and pro-'moted.* I ſhall not be in council, treaty, or any act, 'in which any thing ſhall be imagined againſt him or 'the Church of Rome, their rights, ſeats, honours, or 'powers; and if I know any ſuch to be moved or com-'paſſed, I ſhall reſiſt it to my power; and as ſoon as I 'can I ſhall advertiſe him, or ſuch as may give him 'knowledge. The rules of the holy Fathers, the decrees, 'ordinances, ſentences, diſpoſitions, reſervations, pro-'viſions, and commandments apoſtolic, to my power I 'ſhall keep, and cauſe to be kept of others. *Heretics, 'ſchiſmatics, and rebels to our holy father and his ſucceſſors, 'I ſhall reſiſt and perſecute to my power.* I ſhall come to 'the ſynod when I am called, except I be letted by a 'canonical impediment. The threſholds of the apoſtles 'I ſhall viſit yearly, perſonally or by my deputy. I ſhall 'not alienate or ſell my poſſeſſions without the Pope's 'counſel. So help me God and the holy Evangeliſts.'

In 1793, Dr. Troy, Romiſh Archbiſhop of Dublin, publiſhed a pamphlet, which he ſtyled 'A Paſtoral Let-'ter:' it is in truth a political tract, containing argu-

ments not a little hoſtile to the eſtabliſhed conſtitution in church and ſtate. He endeavours to prove the juſtice, expediency, and even neceſſity of the admiſſion of Romaniſts into the Legiſlature, and into all offices of truſt and confidence; and takes ſpecial care to ſupport, not without ſome degree of addreſs, his arguments, by menaces of the effects which he inſinuates muſt flow from the numbers and puiſſance of the Iriſh Romaniſts, magnified by him infinitely beyond reality. Any reaſonable man would expect that the Doctor would have endeavoured rather to extenuate than openly to aſſert and juſtify the papal juriſdiction in Ireland, which he knew Proteſtants held to be one great impediment to the admiſſion of the Romiſh claims; but it is quite otherwiſe. In page 31 of this pretended Paſtoral Letter is the following paſſage: 'It is a *fundamental article* of the Roman 'Catholic faith, that the Pope or Biſhop of Rome is 'ſucceſſor to St. Peter, Prince of the Apoſtles, in that 'See; he enjoys by divine right a ſpiritual and eccleſi-'aſtical primacy, not only of honour and rank, but of '*real juriſdiction and authority*, in the univerſal church. 'Roman Catholics conceive this point as clearly eſta-'bliſhed in the ſcriptures, and by the conſtant tradition 'of the Fathers in every age, as it is by the *expreſs deci-'ſions of their general councils, which they conſider as in-'fallible authority in points of doctrine.*'

Same author, page 97.—'Catholics cannot conſcien-'tiouſly abjure the eccleſiaſtical authority of the Bi-'ſhop of Rome. He is guardian of the general ca-'nons, and can alone diſpenſe with them *proprio jure*, 'or by inherent right. Others enjoy that power by de-'legation from him. The erection, ſuppreſſion, and

'union

'union of biſhoprics and other benefices; the elevation 'of ſees to the metropolitical dignity and juriſdiction; 'the inſtitution of general faſts and holidays; diſpenſa-'tions from their obſervance; the regulation and in-'ſpection of our liturgy; *appeals from inferior eccleſiaſti-'cal courts to his ſupreme tribunal; the ſuſpenſion and 'reſtoration of biſhops, and numberleſs other particulars of 'our general church diſcipline* mentioned in the canons, 'depend on the Pope as our eccleſiaſtical ſuperior, and 'are connected with his primacy of juriſdiction in the 'univerſal church. *Henry VIII. of England was the firſt 'Chriſtian prince that aſſumed eccleſiaſtical ſupremacy, and 'commanded an enſlaved Parliament to enact it as a law of 'the ſtate. The Catholics conſider it an uſurpation.*'

Same author, page 102.—'The Catholic laity of 'Ireland reſpect their clergy, and conſider it a duty to 'be regulated by their determinations in all points of 'religious doctrine. They are attached to their paſtors 'and ſpiritual guides, who love them as their children 'in Chriſt. *Clergy and laity are united by the moſt tender 'and intereſting conſiderations. Every effort to diſſolve this 'union muſt prove ineffectual; intereſt and duty continue to 'render it indiſſoluble.* In adverſity and proſperity they 'muſt riſe and fall together.'

The ſame author, in another place, ſtates, 'that the 'religious principles of Roman Catholics being un-'changeable, they are applicable to all times.'

It is needleſs here to inſert any other extracts from recent publications of Romiſh writers: I ſhall barely obſerve, that the ſame doctrines are held in a modern

publication of Mr. Huſſey, a Romiſh prieſt, who informs us in it, that he had been appointed Biſhop of Waterford by the Pope. This publication he alſo ſtyles a Paſtoral Letter, though it is perhaps as ſeditious a publication as any which has appeared in modern times, provoking the Iriſh Romaniſts to inſurrection, and drawing a line of eternal demarcation between them and their Proteſtant fellow-ſubjects, ſupported by the whole Romiſh hoſt of anathemas and excommunications.

I will now proceed to anſwer the argument of the author of the '*Caſe of Ireland Re-conſidered*,' in ſupport of his firſt poſition, to wit, *that men ſincerely attached to the whole Romiſh creed may be as good and faithful ſubjects of the Britiſh empire as Proteſtants, and conſequently as ſafely admiſſible to the ſupreme legiſlative and ſuperior executive capacities.* His diffuſive argument on this head, already mentioned, may be thus condenſed: 'In a 'Romiſh ſtate, the ſupremacy of the Church, or its 'ſpiritual authority, has no ſanction, no coercive power 'in this life, and can in no way come in contact with 'civil exiſtence; nor can its tribunal exiſt, ſo as to affect 'any man in his liberty, life, or property, without the 'permiſſion of the ſovereign of that country; and if a 'foreign juriſdiction exiſts in ſuch country, it is to the 'conſent of the ſovereign power, and not to the Roman 'Catholic religion, of which it is no inherent part, it is 'to be aſcribed. In a Proteſtant ſtate, ſuch as Ireland, 'the King, Peers, and nine tenths of the Commons 'being Proteſtants, the conſent of the ſtate never can be 'obtained to the exerciſe of Romiſh eccleſiaſtical juriſ-'diction; therefore in ſuch ſtate no miſchief can ariſe 'from the Romiſh tenet of the ſupremacy of the Pope,

'though

'though Romaniſts ſhould ſit in Parliament, and be 'admitted to the higheſt offices of the ſtate.' Though the premiſes in this ſyllogiſtic argument be admitted to be true, yet the concluſion will by no means follow, that no miſchief will ariſe in a Proteſtant ſtate by the admiſſion of Romaniſts into the ſupreme legiſlative body, and to the exerciſe of the higheſt executive offices of the ſtate, as I ſhall hereafter prove; yet the premiſes require examination. The major propoſition, to wit, *the ſpiritual authority of the Pope not being an inherent part of the Romiſh religion, has no ſanction, and cannot be exerciſed even in Romiſh ſtates, but by the conſent of the ſtate*, is extremely ſophiſtical; it conſiſts in fact of two propoſitions; the firſt is, *the ſpiritual authority of the Pope is not an inherent part of the Romiſh religion*. This propoſition is already clearly proved to be falſe, by the extracts from the Lateran Council, and from Doctor Troy, and by the rejection of the Oath of Supremacy by all Romaniſts. The ſecond part of it, *that this authority has no ſanction in this life, and cannot be exerciſed, even in Romiſh ſtates, but by the conſent of the ſtate*, requires explanation.

In a Romiſh ſtate, the ſovereign power, whether it be a monarchy or a republic, being veſted in Romaniſts, its conſent to the execution of the decrees of their own church, of which they admit the Pope to be ſupreme head, is certain. Romiſh monarchs, and governing members of Romiſh republics, are, by the tenets of their religion, bound, not only to conſent to the execution, but to execute the decrees of their church, as well on the perſons as on the properties of their ſubjects: hence in Romiſh ſtates the ſupremacy of the Pope in ſpirituals amplifies itſelf into the exerciſe of a moſt ex-

tenſive temporal juriſdiction, the ſtate either reſigning to eccleſiaſtical officers the execution of the decrees of the Church on the perſons and properties of its ſubjects, or becoming itſelf the executioner of ſuch decrees: for inſtance, in moſt Romiſh countries, ſuch as the Church deems heretics, or even ſuſpects of being ſo, are impriſoned by eccleſiaſtical officers in eccleſiaſtical priſons, and they are burned by temporal officers when the Church pronounces them heretics irreclaimable, and delivers them over to the ſecular arm; as was the caſe in England before the Reformation and during the reign of Queen Mary: therefore in Romiſh countries, the Church of Rome, and its ſupreme head the Pope, have real juriſdiction, efficient tribunals, and ſanctions to their decrees of the moſt powerful efficacy; and their decrees reach to, and are executed upon, the liberties, lives, and properties, and moſt of the temporal concerns of the ſubjects; and ſuch ſtates are themſelves the executioners of their decrees. This juriſdiction is an inherent part of the Roman Catholic religion, and its title is founded in the very eſſence of that religion. Dr. Troy ſtates, 'that 'the real juriſdiction and authority of the Pope is clearly 'eſtabliſhed by the ſcriptures and the conſtant tradition 'of the Fathers, and the expreſs deciſions of general 'councils, which Roman Catholics conſider as infallible 'authority: *it is a fundamental article of the Roman Ca-* '*tholic faith.*' This doctrine is conformable to the Lateran Council, and to the opinions of all Romiſh writers, ancient or modern, on the ſubject. If a Romiſh ſtate ſhould refuſe to execute the decrees of the Romiſh Church in what are deemed ſpiritual matters, ſuch as hereſy, and many others extending to the liberties, lives, and properties of the ſubjects, which are certainly temporal concerns,

concerns, ſuch ſtates would ceaſe to be Roman Catholic. In ſuch ſtates it is of no moment whether ſuch power or juriſdiction be exerciſed by the Church itſelf, or by the temporal power under the orders and direction of the Church, or by the permiſſion of the temporal power, as long as the acquieſcence and obedience of the temporal power are enſured by the very tenets of their religion.

The Romiſh doctrine of the ſupremacy of the Pope in eccleſiaſtical matters is ſupported in effect and operation by Romiſh ſtates, however in political theory ſtateſmen or lawyers may ſometimes preſume partially to diſſent from it, admitting it in practice, and being themſelves its executioners. But in a Proteſtant ſtate, ſuch a tenet directly militates againſt the very exiſtence of the ſtate, is utterly inconſiſtent with the nature and eſſence of the government, and contrary to its vital principles, both in theory and practice. In Romiſh ſtates, the excluſive juriſdiction of the Pope in all ſpiritual matters, ſo far as the cognizance of the cauſe and pronouncing ſentence, either in the firſt inſtance or on appeal, is admitted to exiſt; but, ſays this author, he is not permitted to execute his ſentence, where it affects temporals, without the approbation of the temporal ſovereignty of the Romiſh ſtates; therefore his ſupremacy is not admitted in ſuch ſtates. This is a miſerable ſophiſm; for as long as ſuch ſtates continue Romiſh, they are bound by the tenets of their religion to execute, and do execute his ſentences, affecting both the lives and properties of their ſubjects, that is, their temporal concerns and intereſts, and do thereby effectually admit his ſupremacy, and become his miniſters, ſervants, and executioners.

As to the minor propoſition of this author's ſyllogiſtic argument, to wit, *that in Ireland, a Proteſtant ſtate, the conſent of the ſtate cannot be procured to the exerciſe of the juriſdiction of the Romiſh Church, and of its head the Pope;* I believe it is now true, and I hope it will always continue ſo; becauſe I hope our rulers in this Proteſtant Britiſh empire never will be induced by falſehood, fraud, and ſophiſtry, to transfer to Romaniſts the political power of the ſtate, which they would not, nor could not, if they continued Romaniſts, fail to uſe for the introduction of their own faith as orthodox, and the ſuppreſſion of the Proteſtant faith as heretical, and conſequently for the eſtabliſhment of the Pope's ſupremacy among their other religious errors. To give this minor propoſition the effect which this author intends, it is not ſufficient that it be admitted to be now true, but it muſt be ſuppoſed that in Ireland it will always continue true, that is, that though Romaniſts be admitted into the ſupreme legiſlative and executive authorities of the ſtate, yet they never will be able, on account of their preſent weakneſs and poverty, to overturn the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment, and conſequently that it cannot be hurtful to the ſtate to admit them. This is at beſt a negative argument; it does not tend to prove that it would be uſeful to the ſtate to admit them, but that it would not be pernicious or detrimental to do ſo; and it at the ſame time, in ſome meaſure, admits, that if they were powerful it would be dangerous for Proteſtants to admit them, and conſequently that Proteſtants have a good right to believe that they would uſe any political power they may acquire, for the ſubverſion of the preſent eſtabliſhment; and this the author more explicitly admits in more than one paſſage, intimating to Iriſh Proteſtants, that if they will admit Romaniſts to the

the ſupreme legiſlative and executive capacities, they may have the guaranty of England for the ſecurity of their church eſtabliſhment; that is, in other words, 'Your church eſtabliſhment, which in the preſent conſtitution of the ſtate is ſecure, will be rendered inſecure by your admiſſion of us into the ſupreme legiſlative and executive capacities; and in that caſe you muſt apply to your friend and neighbour for that ſecurity which you had in your own hands, but which you have fooliſhly relinquiſhed.' And this argument he makes uſe of, when he is apparently endeavouring to diſſuade the Iriſh nation from conſenting to an Incorporating Union with Great Britain, and conſequently to looſen the bands of connexion of the two countries.

The concluſion, however, drawn by this author from theſe premiſes, is not warranted by them, though the truth of the premiſes be admitted; for, even in that caſe, it can be proved that much miſchief may ariſe to the Proteſtant ſtate of Ireland from the admiſſion of Romaniſts to the legiſlative and higheſt executive capacities; and firſt from this author's own ſtatement. In the ſecond page of his pamphlet he ſtates the proportion of Iriſh Romaniſts to Iriſh Proteſtants to be four or five to one. This is a groſs exaggeration; but I am now arguing from his own aſſertions. In a commercial country, property is continually changing hands: landed eſtates, where there is no reſtraint of alienation, change maſters, not ſo rapidly as perſonal property, but though in a ſlower, yet not leſs certain progreſſion: in the courſe of trade, the induſtrious and indigent are continually emerging into opulence; landed property in this country is every day at market, and by purchaſe comes to the

poſſeſſion

poſſeſſion of the ſucceſsful merchant, mechanic, and farmer: hence if in Ireland the maſs of the people, that is, five to one, be Romaniſts, though at preſent the bulk of the property of the nation be in the hands of Proteſtants, yet it will ſhift into thoſe of Romaniſts, by a progreſſion certain, and, conſidering the alledged diſproportion of numbers, not very ſlow. The Iriſh Romaniſts have been very lately admitted to every civil franchiſe enjoyed by the Iriſh Proteſtants, except to the capacity of ſitting in Parliament, and of occupying about thirty of the greateſt offices of the ſtate; they are even rendered capable of becoming members of all corporations in the kingdom. If then they ſhall be admitted to ſit in Parliament, they muſt at a period not very diſtant, as property, admitted by this author to be the baſis of repreſentation, ſhifts to their ſcale, be the repreſentatives in Parliament of all the counties, and of all the boroughs diſtinguiſhed by the name of pot-walloping, and, by leſs rapid degrees, of all or moſt of the other boroughs in the kingdom; that is, they will in a ſhort time compoſe the whole, or at leaſt a vaſt majority of the Houſe of Commons. Their Peers (at preſent indeed very few) will ſit in the Houſe of Lords; ſo that in our ſupreme legiſlative body they will form one, and infinitely the moſt powerful branch, and have a conſiderable influence in the ſecond, and will have power ſufficient to force the third or regal branch to a compliance with all their ſchemes, and oblige it to fill all the great offices of the ſtate with Romaniſts, and introduce as many of them as may amount to a majority into the Houſe of Peers. Hence it is obvious, from this author's own ſtatement, that by admitting Romaniſts to form part of the ſupreme legiſlative power of the ſtate, they will by degrees ſwallow up the whole,

awe

awe the executive into their meaſures, and ſubvert the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment in Ireland from the foundation; for a Romaniſt is bound, by the tenets of his religion, to the beſt of his power to exterminate all heretics, and deſtroy all heretical eſtabliſhments; and this author will not, I believe, deny, that all Romaniſts hold all Proteſtants to be heretics; and as he is alſo by the ſame religion bound to eſtabliſh it in the room of the one ſubverted, and to execute the decrees of the Church of Rome and of its head the Pope, the ſupremacy in ſpirituals, to which a vaſt temporal power is annexed, and from which it is inſeparable, will be in effect and reality torn from the ſtate, and veſted in the Pope, with his conſiſtory, nuncios, and miniſters; and the halcyon days of Queen Mary, and of the bonfires and triumphs of Popery, will return; the writ *de Hæretico comburendo* will again receive the ſanction of Parliament. Such is the ſtatement by which this author endeavours to perſuade Iriſh Proteſtants to betray the political power of the ſtate, and the ſecurity of their own lives and properties, into Romiſh hands!

But waving all advantage which the groſs exaggerations and miſtatements of this author, or the weakneſs of his arguments, may afford, I will expoſe the miſchief to the Proteſtant ſtate of Ireland which muſt ariſe by the admiſſion of Romaniſts into Parliament, from the very nature of its conſtitution and government, and the true ſtate of its population, relative numbers, and views of the different claſſes of its inhabitants.

The ſovereign power of Ireland is veſted in the King, Lords, and Commons; and whatever prince wears the diadem

diadem of Great Britain, he is *ipſo facto* King of Ireland: its population cannot much exceed three millions of people; one third at leaſt of the inhabitants are Proteſtants, two thirds only are Romaniſts: upwards of two millions of the inhabitants are in ſuch a ſtate of poverty, that they cannot pay a yearly tax to the ſtate of four-pence per head without the greateſt diſtreſs, and nine tenths of theſe are Romaniſts. (See Appendix, No. 1.) All ſubjects of a ſtate, who deny that the ſupreme power by which that ſtate is conſtitutionally governed is excluſively entitled to enact and execute all laws for the good government of that ſtate, and who maintain, as part of their religious creed, that a power exiſts extraneous and ſeparate from that ſtate, and not under its control and dominion, which can make laws, and enforce their execution among the ſubjects of that ſtate in many particulars, are enemies to its independence, and traitors. Iriſh Romaniſts univerſally maintain, as an immutable tenet of their religion, the ſupremacy of the Pope in all ſpiritual matters within this kingdom. See the above quotations from Dr. Troy (who ſtyles the power of the ſtate to determine within itſelf, and by its own judicatories, all eccleſiaſtical cauſes, an *uſurpation)*, and all other Romiſh writers on the ſame ſubject. Romaniſts will not take the Oath of Supremacy before ſtated. It is utterly impoſſible and impracticable to ſeparate a vaſt portion of *temporal* power and influence from *ſpiritual* ſupremacy: hereſy is of ſpiritual cognizance, ſo is matrimony; Romaniſts hold it to be a ſacrament; and as to its validity, their canons are in many inſtances different from ours, they declaring marriages null and void, which by our laws are valid, and *vice verſâ*. What degree of temporal power and influence does the ſupremacy in ſpirituals derive from the excluſive juriſdiction reſpecting

hereſy? Look to the Lateran Council already quoted! What degree of temporal power and influence does the excluſive matrimonial juriſdiction confer? Legitimacy and ſucceſſion to property real and perſonal, and almoſt every combination of circumſtances under which ſuch ſucceſſion might be claimed, depend on the matrimonial juriſdiction. A thouſand other inſtances can be adduced of the inſeparability of ſupreme juriſdiction in ſpiritual, from vaſt power and influence in temporal concerns. The Popes for ages have uſurped temporal authority as incident to their ſpiritual ſupremacy in various Chriſtian ſtates, and under that title alone; and as to the extent and influence of this juriſdiction, the decline of the Pope's power as a temporal prince does not in the leaſt diminiſh them: as a temporal prince, the Pope never was conſiderable; the eſſence of his uſurpation is in his dominion over the minds of Romaniſts in the ſtate; if they are very numerous, they muſt be dangerous in proportion to their numbers, wealth, and influence in a Proteſtant ſtate, though the Pope ſhould be completely ſtripped of all his dominions and territories. The tyranny exerted by the Pope in temporals, under colour of his ſpiritual ſupremacy, is painted in our hiſtories, and in the preambles of the ſtatutes enacted both in England and Ireland for aboliſhing his uſurpation. See the Engliſh ſtatutes 25th Henry VIII. chap. 21.; 32d Henry VIII. chap. 38.; 1ſt of Elizabeth, chap. 1.; and Iriſh ſtatutes 28th Henry VIII. chap. 13. 19.; 33d Henry VIII. chap. 6.; 2d of Elizabeth, chap. 1. The late Lord Cheſterfield, whom no man will accuſe of much prejudice in religious matters, when Lord Lieutenant of Ireland in 1745, expreſſed himſelf, in his ſpeech from the Throne to the Iriſh Parliament, in the following manner: 'However,

'I leave

'I leave to your conſideration whether nothing further 'can be done, either by new laws, or the more effectual 'execution of thoſe in being, to ſecure this nation againſt 'the great number of Papiſts, *whoſe ſpeculative errors* '*would only deſerve pity, did not their pernicious influence* '*on civil ſociety require and authorize reſtraint.*' This Lord was one of thoſe men who, according to the author of '*The Caſe of Ireland Re-conſidered,*' was prejudiced and ill-informed, when compared with himſelf! And now I aſk this author, whether he can produce a ſingle inſtance in which a ſtate having ſufficient power to exclude all traitors from its ſovereignty, voluntarily called them to the exerciſe of ſupreme power? This would be the caſe, if Romaniſts in Ireland were admitted into the Houſes of Lords and Commons; for in theſe Houſes, in conjunction with the King, and not in the King alone, is lodged the ſupreme power of the ſtate; and ſuch is the peculiar characteriſtic of our conſtitution, which is a limited monarchy: if the Government of Ireland were guilty of ſuch folly, it would richly merit political diſſolution, and might be juſtly termed *felo de ſe.* Shall we give voices in the ſupreme legiſlative aſſembly, inveſted with the ſovereign power, to thoſe who are taught by their religion not only to renounce and diſobey, but to vilify and traduce the ſupremacy of that Legiſlature, and who thus ally ſuperſtition with treaſon, and, as it were, ſanctify rebellion? In the Britiſh empire, experience has ſhown the folly, nay madneſs, of inveſting Romaniſts with ſupreme power. King James the Second, who was perverted from the Proteſtant religion to Popery during his exile, no ſooner aſcended the Throne, than he ſet every engine to work, for the purpoſe of eſtabliſhing Popery on the ruins of the religion of his country: he was a prince

not deſtitute of qualities which might have ſecured to him the affection of his ſubjects, both as a man and a monarch; but his unfortunate attachment to Popery made him ſet at nought all political and moral obligation; regardleſs of his coronation oath, he made uſe of all the advantages which his ſituation afforded him, to violate every principle of the conſtitution, for the ſole purpoſe of ſurrendering the ſupremacy of the ſtate to a foreign judicatory, attempting to ſubjugate the independent Britiſh empire to the Papacy, to ſhare the regal authority with the Pope, and to reign partly as his vaſſal: the obligation of a ſolemn oath yielded to his bigotry, and he reduced to practice the Romiſh doctrine, that all oaths, the obligations of which militate in any reſpect againſt the tenets of their church, are in themſelves impious, unlawful, and void. His conduct is a perpetual leſſon to Proteſtants, not to rely with too much confidence on the oaths of Romaniſts, the obligations of which operate againſt their religious opinions.

The above arguments alſo prove the miſchief which muſt ariſe from committing to Romaniſts the higher executive offices of the ſtate; they would be thereby entruſted with the execution of laws, which they are bound in conſcience to reſiſt, and which they look upon as impious and heretical. Common ſenſe exclaims againſt ſuch monſtrous and deſtructive projects of innovation! All Proteſtants muſt for ever deprecate and oppoſe the granting any part of the ſupreme power of the ſtate, whether legiſlative or executive, to Romaniſts, who muſt ever direct that power unceaſingly to the deſtruction of the Proteſtant religion, and the eſtabliſhment of their own; and this they can never have any reaſonable hope to effect, ſave

ſave by a total change in the conſtitution. It is impoſſible that any Romaniſt can honeſtly and zealouſly adminiſter the affairs of a Proteſtant ſtate; he would ceaſe to be a Romaniſt, if he did not perſeveringly aim at ſupremacy, and the paramount eſtabliſhment of the Romiſh religion. Romaniſts could not be content to ſhare equal power with thoſe they believe to be heretics: the moſt ſacred engagements (as we ſee, among a thouſand inſtances, in the conduct of James the Second), if contrary to, or not coinciding with, the intereſts of their church, are by that church diſſolved, and declared void.

The argument of this author, that repreſentation by the Britiſh conſtitution is in the ſame ratio with property, that Proteſtant property is to that of Romiſh property in Ireland in the proportion of ten to one, and that conſequently no danger can accrue to the Proteſtant intereſt by the admiſſion of Romaniſts into Parliament, I have anſwered pretty fully already, from the fluctuation of property in a commercial ſtate, from the relative numbers of Iriſh Proteſtants and Romaniſts, and the avowed political creed of the latter claſs. But though I were to admit, that property and conſequent repreſentation would always remain in the ſame ratio, yet I can point out many miſchiefs to the eſtabliſhment in church and ſtate, which would moſt certainly flow from the admiſſion of Romaniſts to ſeats in Parliament. When King James the Second undertook the ſubverſion of the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment in England and Ireland, the two great branches of the ſupreme authority of both nations, to wit, the Houſes of Lords and Commons, conſiſted of Proteſtants only. The ſupreme executive, being only one branch of the ſovereign authority of the empire, attempted to carry into execution

execution this desperate project: history informs us it was very near succeeding, and would with certainty have succeeded, at least in Ireland, had not a great continental power, nearly allied to the Throne, interfered for our preservation, roused the energy of the empire, and defeated a design founded in bigotry, and consequent perjury. At that time one branch of the supreme authority was near effecting so desperate an enterprise; what mischiefs and innovations may not be expected, in case the other two branches, or either of them, and particularly the popular branch, the House of Commons, should become even partially corrupted with Romish bigotry, hostile, and incurably so, to the constitution both in Church and State! All persons know that the House of Commons, if uninfluenced by the monarchy and aristocracy, could subvert the state; it did so once, and if led by desperate and wicked politicians, might do so again: the very existence of our political establishment depends on the constitutional influence of the King and Peers among the Commons; and is it consistent with the rules of political wisdom, to suffer any part of that assembly to be composed of the determined, deadly, irreclaimable enemies of the constitution, and of the independence of the empire? This author supposes that a tenth part of that House would be immediately occupied by Romish representatives, in case they were admitted to sit in Parliament; but whatever their number might be at first, it certainly would constantly increase, from the shifting of property in commercial countries to that class of subjects which is most numerous. The concession then to Romanists of the capacity of sitting in Parliament, would be the immediate admission of thirty members into the House of Commons, determined enemies of the constitution in Church and State,

who would be always ready to join any diſcontented party in Parliament in oppoſition to the Crown and its Miniſters; any ſet of profligate deſperadoes; the profeſſed patrons of two oppoſition meaſures, dignified with the ſpecious and impoſing titles of *Emancipation and Reform*, ſignifying, in the vocabulary of the Iriſh Rebels, *Popery and Republicaniſm* (as is fully proved in the Reports of the Secret Committees of the Britiſh and Iriſh Houſes of Lords and Commons), or in any other meaſures for the deſtruction of the conſtitution. Romiſh Iriſh members of Parliament would ſupport emancipation from the principles of their religion, and reform as ancillary to emancipation, becauſe moſt of the boroughs are at preſent under the influence of Proteſtants; and though Romaniſts are rendered capable of being members of corporations by the act of 1793 in their favour, yet it will take ſome time before its operation can enſure to them any domineering intereſt in boroughs: beſides, the Iriſh Romaniſts are now almoſt univerſally determined Republicans, as I ſhall hereafter ſhow.

It is pretty certain, if Romaniſts were admiſſible into Parliament, that a greater number of them would obtain ſeats, than their property entitles them to expect, on the ſcale laid down by this author; for the loweſt orders of the Iriſh population are almoſt all Romaniſts, and particularly the Iriſh peaſantry. Mr. Tone, in his State of Ireland, drawn up for the uſe of the French Convention, ſtates, that the whole of the Iriſh peaſantry may be ſaid to be Romaniſts, and ſemi-barbarous. The Iriſh Proteſtant Nobility and Gentry, after the paſſing of the act which enabled Romaniſts to vote at elections of members of Parliament, ſeemed to be ſeized with a mania for making

ing forty-ſhilling freeholders, each vying with his neighbour for qualifying the greateſt number of voters at county elections; and moſt of their tenantry being Romaniſts, they made forty-ſhilling freeholders of a vaſt number of them, under the vain opinion, that they would be always able to command their votes: hence, in many counties, the forty-ſhilling Romiſh freeholders exceed in numbers the Proteſtant freeholders, and woful experience has now proved to the Proteſtant landlords their miſtake, in ſuppoſing that the votes of their Romiſh tenants would be at their diſpoſal; for in the late Romiſh Rebellion it was remarkable, that the inſurgent peaſants purſued their landlords with the greateſt inveteracy, murdered ſuch of them as fell into their hands, burned their houſes, and waſted their property: in fact, theſe half-ſavages are moſtly under the direction and influence of their prieſts, who would generally ſway county elections; and I need not make uſe of many arguments to prove, that the perſons elected as repreſentatives for moſt of the counties would very ſoon be all Romaniſts, whether they had property or not: the ſame would be the caſe in all or moſt of the boroughs diſtinguiſhed by the name of Pot-walloping; of which, I think, there are eight in the kingdom: ſo that the Romiſh repreſentation would immediately amount to much more than a tenth of the Houſe of Commons; and this would be an evil daily increaſing. All theſe Romiſh repreſentatives would moſt certainly unite together, and act in conjunction with every diſcontented party againſt the Government, whilſt it continued Proteſtant; and as all ſuch parties would join the Romaniſts in making breaches in the conſtitution favourable to their views, to procure their co-operation in their own deſigns, what incalculable miſchiefs muſt ariſe, and what certain ruin to the preſent

eſtabliſhment in Church and State, from the admiſſion of Romaniſts into Parliament! I am firmly perſuaded that His Majeſty, a truly pious prince, will never be induced to concur in ſo fatal a meaſure, but will conceive that his concurrence would be a violation of his coronation oath, inaſmuch as it would directly tend to the overthrow of that religious eſtabliſhment which he has ſolemnly ſworn to maintain and defend.

The ſecond general argument of this author on which he reſts the Romiſh claims of political power, *viz.* that Romaniſts have a right to ſeats in Parliament in proportion to their property, becauſe property is, by the Britiſh conſtitution, the baſis of repreſentation, is very eaſily refuted. Admitting property to be the baſis of repreſentation, yet by no force of argument can it be proved, that a claſs of people, from religious principle the determined enemies of the ſtate, traitors in theory, and always in practice, when they dare, be their property what it may, have a right to be admitted into the ſupreme legiſlative power of the ſtate; they ought to be excluded by every principle on which civil ſocieties are founded: and ſo far from being entitled to the enjoyment of any political power in a ſtate, they ought to be extremely well contented with, and, if they have any ſparks of gratitude, very thankful for, being permitted to remain within the territories of the ſtate, and enjoy the protection and benefits of it. Proteſtant ſtates affording ſuch indulgence to their Romiſh ſubjects act on a true Chriſtian principle; they forgive their enemies, perſecutors, and ſlanderers, heap benefits upon them, and deprive them of nothing, except the power of injuring their protectors. The greater part of the above reaſoning applies as well to the rejection of Romaniſts

maniſts from ſeats in the United Parliament, when an Incorporating Union ſhall take place between Great Britain and Ireland, as from ſeats in the Iriſh Parliament: their admiſſion into either would be a fatal breach in the conſtitution: the conſequence of ſuch an innovation in England I ſhall hereafter enlarge on.

I ſhall conclude this part of my anſwer to the author's ſophiſtical argument, to prove the Romiſh principle of Papal ſupremacy to be no reaſonable objection to Romaniſts enjoying part of the ſovereign authority of the Proteſtant ſtate of Ireland by ſitting in Parliament, and being admitted to the higheſt executive offices, with obſerving that his petulant aſſertion, that no well-informed man would make it twice, is in fact an aſſertion, that all Engliſh and Iriſh ſtateſmen and ſenators in the reigns of Henry the Eighth, Edward the Sixth, Elizabeth, and ever ſince, were ignorant politicians when compared with himſelf, and have drawn on themſelves the contempt of the whole world, by excluding Romaniſts from ſovereign power, as he in one place expreſſes himſelf. Such preſumption and ignorance demonſtrate him to be an Iriſhman, bred in an academy of modern French philoſophers, the only rival of whoſe characteriſtic preſumption is their ignorance.

It is very difficult to determine, whether this author's next argument betrays moſt ignorance or malice. He begins it by ſtating, 'that Roman Catholics do not deny the 'ſole right of the ſtate to manage the concerns, eſtabliſh-'ment, *faith and diſcipline* of the Church of England;' thereby, indirectly, but not leſs deciſively, aſſerting, that the *faith and diſcipline* of the Church of England are mere

creatures of ſtate policy, and that ſuch faith is not founded on, nor its diſcipline regulated by, the holy Scriptures, the revealed word of God, but is of mere human invention, or rather impoſition :—moſt condeſcending admiſſion of this Romiſh writer! At the very time he is endeavouring to perſuade Proteſtants to acquieſce in the Romiſh claims, he cannot, in the true ſpirit of Popery, forbear introducing, in almoſt every paragraph, ſome ſneer or malignant falſehood againſt the eſtabliſhed church. The ſtate has not aſſumed the power in the Britiſh empire to manage the faith of its ſubjects, ſo far as that faith relates merely to ſpiritual concerns, if by managing is meant the determining the articles of faith: all ſuch are determined by convocations of the Clergy, according to the doctrines laid down in the holy Scriptures: the ſame is true with reſpect to the diſcipline of the Church, which is ſettled and regulated by the canons agreed on in convocation, which convocation ſits by the authority of the Crown. As to the eſtabliſhment and revenues of the Church, the Britiſh ſtate does always interfere, as they relate to the temporal concerns of the Clergy and Laity both; and hence the canons agreed on at convocation, relating neceſſarily to temporal matters, as well as ſpiritual, indiſſolubly connected, muſt, to give them a temporal authority, be approved of by the ſovereign power; but they bind the Clergy, without the ſanction of Parliament, in all points of faith and diſcipline. The authority of Parliament is alſo neceſſary to warrant and enforce the public exerciſe of religion; and ſuch interference of the ſtate the encroaching ſyſtem of the Romiſh church on the temporal power of princes and ſtates throughout the Chriſtian world made abſolutely neceſſary, multiplying corruptions in that particular for a ſeries of centuries. After thus ſneering

maliciouſly

maliciouſly at the eſtabliſhed church, this author proceeds: ‘ *Roman Catholics do not admit the King of England to be* ‘ *ſpiritual head of the Roman Catholic church, nor do the* ‘ *Preſbyterians admit him to be head of theirs: this was not* ‘ *a reaſon for excluding the Scotch from a ſhare in the Legiſ-* ‘ *lature of the country they were united to*; *why then ſhould it* ‘ *exclude the Iriſh?*’ It is to be obſerved firſt, that he inſinuates the Romiſh church is the church of the Iriſh in general; I ſhall hereafter expoſe the fraud of that inſinuation; but I muſt firſt examine his argument, admitting, that I verily believe from ſome other paſſages in his pamphlet, it is partly founded on the author's profound ignorance of the laws of his country, which he manifeſts in more than one inſtance, when writing on the repealed Iriſh Popery code, and its effects in ſociety.

The original Oath of Supremacy, as ordained to be taken by the 28th of Henry VIII. chap. 13. contained the following clauſe: ‘ ſhall accept, repute, and take the ‘ King's Majeſty to be the *the only ſupreme head on earth* ‘ of the Church of England and Ireland.’ This oath was complained of, as an acknowledgment of a ſacerdotal power in the temporal ſovereign. Queen Elizabeth, after her acceſſion, when ſhe cauſed the laws againſt the Pope's authority, which had been repealed by her ſiſter Mary, to be re-enacted, altered Henry's Oath of Supremacy, or rather cauſed an entirely new Oath to be enacted in the room of Henry's: in this new Oath of Supremacy is the following clauſe: ‘ I —— do utterly teſtify and declare ‘ in my conſcience, that the Queen's Highneſs is the only ‘ *ſupreme governor of this realm*, and of all other her High- ‘ neſs's dominions and countries, *as well in all ſpiritual* ‘ *or eccleſiaſtical things or cauſes as in temporal.*’ (See Iriſh

Act, 2d Eliz. chap. 1. ſect. 7.) And to prevent all cavil, the Queen publiſhed an explanation of this Oath of Supremacy, declaring, 'that ſhe did not under colour 'thereof claim any prieſtly power, but merely under 'God to have the ſovereignty and rule over all manner of 'perſons born within her dominions, of what eſtate, whe-'ther eccleſiaſtical or temporal, ſoever they be, ſo as no 'other foreign power ſhall or ought to have any ſuperi-'ority over them.' (See 1ſt vol. Carte's Hiſtory of the Duke of Ormond, page 38.) This Oath of Supremacy was afterwards abrogated by the Engliſh act of the 1ſt of William and Mary, and a new Oath was ſubſtituted in its place: for it was found that King James the Second, under the ſanction of this Oath, had aſſumed a moſt unconſtitutional power in the affairs of the Church, and uſed it for the ſubverſion of the eſtabliſhed conſtitution in Church and State. By this new Oath all perſons, to whom it was by law adminiſtered, *only diſclaimed and abjured all foreign authority or juriſdiction in eccleſiaſtical matters within the realm, and did not ſwear that the Monarch was either ſupreme head, or ſupreme governor of the Church of the realm.* It is enacted, that this Oath ſhall be taken in Ireland as well as in England. I have given this Oath at large before. Hence it is obvious, that Iriſh Romaniſts are not excluded from Parliament, and from occupying the higheſt offices in the ſtate, by their not admitting the King to be ſupreme head of the Church, as this author ignorantly ſtates, but they exclude themſelves by refuſing to abjure the authority of a foreign prince and prelate within the realm.

The Reformation in Scotland was introduced by divines who were the diſciples of Calvin: his doctrines

were univerſally received by the Reformed in Scotland; and though James the Firſt and Charles the Firſt did introduce epiſcopacy into that kingdom, it was almoſt univerſally oppoſed by the maſs of the people, both high and low. Epiſcopacy was ſubverted, and Preſbyterianiſm eſtabliſhed in the great civil war, which commenced in the year 1641. On the Reſtoration, epiſcopacy was reſtored, and held its place with great difficulty till the Revolution in 1688, when Preſbyterianiſm was again introduced in Scotland on the ruins of Epiſcopacy, and was eſtabliſhed by the King and Parliament, as the religion of the ſtate. The Union of the two kingdoms of England and Scotland took place long afterwards, in the 5th year of Queen Anne; and previous to the Union, and preparative thereto, an act was paſſed in England for the ſecurity of the Church of England, whereby the Acts of Uniformity, as they then ſtood, are declared perpetual; as alſo all other acts then in force for the preſervation of the Church of England: and it is enacted, that every ſubſequent King and Queen ſhall take an oath inviolably to maintain the ſame, within England, Ireland, Wales, and the town of Berwick upon Tweed: and a ſimilar act, previous to the Union, and preparative thereto, was paſſed in Scotland, for the perpetual ſecurity of Preſbyterianiſm in that kingdom, being then, and long before, its eſtabliſhed religion. Theſe two acts are inſerted in the body of the Act of Union of the two kingdoms; and by that act it is enacted, that the aforeſaid two acts ſhall for ever be obſerved as fundamental and eſſential conditions of the Union. The twenty-ſecond article of the conditions of that Union inſerted in, and ratified by, the Act of Union, provides, that all members of the United

United Parliament, Engliſh and Scotch, ſhall, previous to their voting in Parliament, take the oath already mentioned, ſubſtituted by the 1ſt of William and Mary in the room of the former Oath of Supremacy, and the Oath of Abjuration of the deſcendants of the late King James the Second, and repeat and ſign the Declaration againſt Popery. (See Defoe's Hiſtory of the Union, and the Engliſh Statute 5th Anne, chap. 8.) Sir William Blackſtone obſerves on this Act of Union, that any alteration in the conſtitution of either of theſe churches, or in the liturgy of the Church of England, would be an infringement of theſe fundamental and eſſential conditions, and greatly endanger the Union. (See Blackſtone's Commentaries, octavo edit. vol. i. page 98.)

As to particulars reſpecting the diſcipline of the Kirk of Scotland, I confeſs myſelf not well informed, nor can I ſay whether it does, or does not, admit the King to be its ſupreme head; but this I will venture to advance, that the King's Commiſſioner ſits in every general aſſembly of the Kirk of Scotland, and the ſtate exerciſes pretty much the ſame controlling power over that Kirk, as it does over the Church of England. The admiſſion, that the King is ſupreme head over the Kirk of Scotland, is not required as a qualification for a Scotch member to ſit in the Parliament of Great Britain, nor for any member, whether Scotch or Engliſh: but the abjuration of all foreign eccleſiaſtical or ſpiritual juriſdiction within the realm is required as a qualification: this abjuration all Scotch members actually make, and therefore they are admitted to ſit in Parliament; but all Iriſh Romaniſts abſolutely refuſe to make this abjuration, and therefore exclude themſelves from that privilege: and the author's argument,

argument, that Iriſh Romaniſts ſhould be qualified to ſit in Parliament, becauſe Scotch Preſbyterians are qualified ſo to do, is a compound of ignorance and fraud.

It is here proper to take notice of another argument of this author ſomewhat of the ſame kind with the former. 'Scotland' (he obſerves, in page 10) 'has preſerved her 'religious eſtabliſhment in oppoſition to that of England, 'and an epiſcopal party at home;' and from thence he deduces, in many parts of his pamphlet, 'that Popery 'ſhould be the eſtabliſhed religion in Ireland, in caſe of 'an Union, in oppoſition to that of England, and a Pro-'teſtant party in Ireland.'

The Churches of England and Scotland differ but little in points of faith; their chief diſagreements relate to points of diſcipline: they are both Proteſtant churches, both diſavow the ſpiritual ſupremacy of the Pope, both diſclaim all partnerſhip of dominion within the realm between the ſtate and any foreign power; and as to this cardinal point, on which all political authority and legitimate government reſt in the Britiſh Empire, theſe two Churches are ſo far from being in oppoſition, that there is the moſt perfect harmony between them: no dangerous convulſions in the body politic by the claſhing of juriſdictions can ariſe from the one Church being eſtabliſhed in one part, and the other in another part of the united kingdom; nor can the allegiance of the ſubject be diſtracted by the conflict of contending authorities. Preſbyterianiſm was the eſtabliſhed religion of Scotland at the time of the Union, and long previous to it; conſequently Scotland did not preſerve it in oppoſition to England, for England did not attempt to ſubvert the religion of Scotland, or claim any right ſo to do; and it is a very ſtrange

and

and unwarranted aſſumption of this author, that the preſervation of that which I am in full undiſturbed poſſeſſion of by a lawful title, and the enjoyment of which by me is not and cannot be in any ſhape detrimental to my neighbour, is retained by me in oppoſition to him, on my concluding a treaty with him for a cloſer connexion and alliance.

Let us now compare the Preſent State of Ireland as to Religion, with that of Scotland at the time of the Union with England, which I have already ſtated. The preſent eſtabliſhed religion in Ireland is the Proteſtant; and this author's argument for the eſtabliſhment of Popery in Ireland, in caſe of an Union, deduced from the religious ſtate of Scotland at the time of its Union with England, is thus: At the Union, Scotland retained her eſtabliſhed religion in oppoſition to England; *ergo*, Ireland, on an Union with England, ſhould ſubvert her eſtabliſhed religion, being the ſame with that of England, and ſet up Popery as her eſtabliſhment in oppoſition to England! Such reaſoning puts me in mind of Swift's deſcription of a lady's arguments:

> 'Her arguments directly tend
> 'Againſt the ſide ſhe would defend.'

The inevitable deduction from the author's ſtatement is directly contrary to his. It follows from the conduct of Scotland at the Union, as ſtated by him, that Ireland ſhould, on an Union with Great Britain, preſerve her eſtabliſhed religion as Scotland did, and not ſuffer it to be ſubverted, impaired, or changed; and the more ſo, as it is the ſame with that of England.

The

The modeſty of this author, diſcoverable from his pamphlet, is as remarkable as any other of his qualities: he with great condeſcenſion tells the people of Great Britain that *he* will conſent to an Union of Ireland with their kingdom, provided the eſtabliſhment of Popery in Ireland be one of the conditions; and he calls ſuch an Union a fair and broad Union. In page 6 he thus expreſſes himſelf: 'I think it right to declare that I 'am no enemy to this meaſure, provided it be a fair 'and broad Union;' and this his moſt gracious and conciliating opinion he more fully explains in many paſſages of his pamphlet, evidently aiming at ſtriking a bargain with the Britiſh Government for an Union; the price which he demands for the conſent of Iriſh Romaniſts to the meaſure being no leſs than the ſubverſion of the Proteſtant religion in Ireland by the power of Great Britain; and he very audaciouſly urges the expediency of ſuch a proceeding on the part of Great Britain, by magnifying the ſtrength of the Iriſh Romaniſts, by the moſt impudent threats of their rebellion, and the powerful interference of his old aſſociates, the French aſſaſſins, on their behalf, in caſe his terms be rejected. This traitorous part of his arguments I ſhall more particularly notice hereafter, and refer to the paſſages in his pamphlet which contain them.

As this writer thinks fit in ſome few paſſages to aſſume the maſk of what he eſteems moderation, and pretend that *all* he requires for Iriſh Romaniſts is a full equality of all kind of privileges, and the enjoyment of part of the ſovereignty of the ſtate with Proteſtants; (very moderate requiſitions indeed!) which he endeavours to ſhow from

from the ſuperiority of the wealth and eſtates of Proteſtants, cannot be dangerous to the ſtate; it may not be amiſs here to take a peep under his maſk, where may be eaſily diſcovered the hideous and ferocious features of the French Revolutioniſt, in all their terrific deformity, and that he really conſiders all the claims he makes on behalf of Iriſh Romaniſts (and which he aſks ſometimes as boons in a ſtyle of ſturdy ſolicitation, and ſometimes demands them with inſult and menace), merely as the means of enabling his party to overturn the conſtitution in Church and State. I will for this purpoſe ſelect one paſſage, though his real views may be diſcovered by almoſt every paſſage in his pamphlet. In page 40 he writes thus: 'I am now come to that important truth, which 'modern political writers on religious eſtabliſhments, as 'I am informed, lay down as a principle, *that every ſtate 'ought to eſtabliſh the religious ſect which is moſt numerous. 'If the neceſſity, or even the bare utility of Religion in a State 'be admitted, this truth forces itſelf on the mind moſt adverſe to conviction, as imperiouſly as thoſe axioms which 'no arguments can render clearer.*' He then proceeds to ſhow, that no religious eſtabliſhment is neceſſary in a ſtate, 'becauſe Popery has anſwered all the true purpoſes 'of religion in Ireland without an eſtabliſhment.' He then argues, that the ſtate may juſtly refuſe any ſupport to the miniſters of the eſtabliſhed Church; becauſe, as he aſſerts 'the revenue enjoyed by the Church is part of 'the common ſtock left to the diſcretion of the ſtate to 'employ to the beſt advantage of the community; and 'the Iriſh Legiſlature have a right to determine whether 'it be right or wrong to apply it to the eſtabliſhment of 'the Proteſtant Church; and that it would be both wiſe

'and

'and generous for the Government to apply part of it 'at leaſt to the ſupport (that is, eſtabliſhment) of Iriſh 'Romiſh prieſts.'

The poſition of this author, the inconteſtable truth of which he aſſerts with ſuch dogmatic aſſurance, to wit, *that every ſtate ought to eſtabliſh the religious ſect which is moſt numerous, if the utility of Religion in a State be admitted*, is firſt to be examined; becauſe, as the author has frequently ſtated the Iriſh Romaniſts to be moſt numerous in Ireland, he in fact lays it down as a poſition, the truth of which cannot be diſputed, *that Popery ought to be eſtabliſhed by the Iriſh Government, and the revenues of the Church applied to the ſupport of Romiſh prieſts.* Here then he tells us fairly and openly, that equality of privileges, and a ſhare in the ſovereignty of the ſtate, will not content Iriſh Romaniſts; *that the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment muſt and ought to be deſtroyed, and Popery placed in its room;* and that the truth of this laſt propoſition is inconteſtable. But I cannot agree in the alleged inconteſtable truth of this poſition. I admit that Religion is both uſeful and neceſſary in a State; it diſpoſes the minds of men to the exerciſe of all the moral virtues, and to a cheerful ſubmiſſion to that degree of ſubordination which is the principal link of connexion in all ſocieties; it has prime influence in curbing unruly paſſions, and reſtraining the turbulence of inordinate appetites and deſires; it therefore ought to be cheriſhed and encouraged by all rulers of States and Empires: but I cannot admit that a religious eſtabliſhment is to be always regulated by the number of the ſubjects of a ſtate maintaining particular dogmas, if ſuch dogmas are found, by the beſt informed and moſt reſpectable part of the ſtate, to be inconſiſtent

conſiſtent with the nature and conſtitution of the ſociety, and ſubverſive of the very frame of it: I cannot admit, that Chriſtianity is to be treated as a mere engine of ſtate, though true Chriſtianity is certainly a great prop of the ſtate: nor can I ever admit, that uſurpation of part of the ſovereignty of the ſtate, or tranſlation of it to a foreign power, are any parts of Chriſtianity; and although the rabble of a country ſhould maintain ſuch a pernicious doctrine as a tenet of religion, and although the rabble in every country exceed the wealthy and informed part of the community, I cannot conceive that the government of a country is obliged to abdicate part of its ſovereign authority, and conſent to the eſtabliſhment of ſuch a divided power, of an *imperium in imperio*, though the rabble ſhould be deſirous, on the ſcore of religion, to eſtabliſh ſuch a kind of mixed government, as in itſelf, in its very nature, contains the ſeeds of anarchy and confuſion.

The deſires or wiſhes of the majority of the ſubjects of a State cannot be complied with, without evident deſtruction of the ſtate, in many inſtances. In all States in the world, the poor exceed the rich in number, and they univerſally wiſh for a diviſion of the property of the wealthy; yet laws for an equal diviſion of property, real and perſonal, of the nature of agrarian laws, are held to be deſtructive to all ſtates, and ſubverſive of all induſtry, arts, and ſciences: and ſurely property, its acquiſition and preſervation, act as powerfully on the paſſions and prejudices of the people in general as religion, or the maintenance or ſubverſion of religious eſtabliſhments: and political writers might as well maintain that laws for the equal diviſion of property ſhould be

enacted

enacted by the State, as that it ſhould eſtabliſh that Sect of Religion, whoſe votaries among its ſubjects were moſt numerous.

This author admits, that the repreſentatives of the people in Parliament, or the Commons, the popular and moſt efficient branch of the ſupreme authority of the State, are to be elected by the people, reckoned according to their property, not their number. He aſſerts, that the ſupreme authority of the State can juſtly apply the Revenues of the Church to the ſupport and eſtabliſhment of any religion it may think proper; and yet aſſerts, in contradiction to theſe premiſes, that the State is bound to eſtabliſh that ſect whoſe votaries are moſt numerous, and not that whoſe votaries poſſeſs moſt property. How infinitely greater does the abſurdity of ſuch deduction appear, when we reflect that the expediency of the eſtabliſhment of a Religion ſubverſive of the independence and the very exiſtence of the State is ſupported by ſuch arguments!

Governments certainly act wiſely in ſuiting their laws to the eſtabliſhed opinions of the maſs of their ſubjects; but in collecting the opinions of that maſs, number is not ſo much to be regarded as property, ſtation, rank, and reſpectability. The multitude is even proverbially ignorant. Information and judgment, the reſult of education, which the generality of mankind never attain, and which is not in fact neceſſary for their ſtations and occupations in life, are almoſt peculiar to the wealthy, or at leaſt to thoſe who are above indigence or the avocations of manual labour. In Ireland, if the opinion of the maſs of the ſubjects, collected in the manner

before mentioned, is to determine the religious eſtabliſh-ment, the weight of the Proteſtant body, though inferior in number, would infinitely outweigh that of the Romaniſts; and the Proteſtant faith muſt continue to be the eſtabliſhed religion, if the predominant opinion of the ſubjects, aſcertained by the common rules of reaſon and true political wiſdom, is to be the regulator of the conduct of the State in point of religion. Forty-nine parts out of fifty of the landed eſtates in Ireland are in the poſſeſſion of Proteſtants, and nineteen parts out of twenty of perſonal eſtates; ſo that they exceed the Romaniſts in wealth in the proportion of forty to one at leaſt (See Appendix, No. 1.), and not in the proportion of ten to one only, as this author, and the writer he undertakes to anſwer, have aſſumed. Of two millions of Iriſh inhabitants, ſo indigent as not to be able to pay a tax of four-pence per head yearly to the State, nine tenths are Romaniſts; in fact, almoſt the whole beggary of the kingdom are Romaniſts: how ſuperlative, then, is the audacity of this Romiſh writer, in maintaining that Popery ought to be and muſt be the eſtabliſhed religion in Ireland, becauſe it is the religion of the greateſt number of Iriſh ſubjects! Is the mob of a nation to determine its religious eſtabliſhment? Is the mob to ſubject the nation to a foreign power?

But this ſelf-evidently true poſition, in the opinion of this writer, that Popery ought to be the eſtabliſhed religion in Ireland, becauſe Iriſh Romaniſts out-number Iriſh Proteſtants, may be very eaſily refuted even on the ſcore of numbers, and even admitting that ſuperiority of number of ſubjects, reckoned not by property and reſpectability, but by the poll, ſhould determine the eſtabliſhment of the religion of the State; for Ireland is not a

kingdom

kingdom ſeparate and diſtinct from Great Britain. Even in its preſent ſtate it is ſo cloſely connected with Great Britain, that the ableſt writers againſt an Incorporating Union of the two nations found their ſtrongeſt arguments on this poſition, that the preſent connexion between Great Britain and Ireland is ſo ſtrong as to be nearly indiſſoluble, and they deduce, that therefore no further Union is neceſſary. Certain it is, that the preſent connexion of the two iſlands approaches very near to a complete Union. The kingdom of Ireland, by the laws of the land, is for ever annexed to, dependant upon, and inſeparably united to, the imperial crown of Great Britain. Whoever is King of Great Britain, is *ipſo facto* King of Ireland. No Act of Parliament can paſs in Ireland till after it has been ſent into England, and has there the great ſeal of England affixed to it. Ireland is notoriouſly part of the Britiſh empire: the King of Great Britain is obliged at his coronation to ſwear that he will maintain the Proteſtant religion in Ireland. The inhabitants of Great Britain are almoſt all Proteſtants. If my memory does not deceive me, an inquiry into the number of Romaniſts in England was a few years ago made with great accuracy, by the authority of Government, on complaints of ſome zealous Proteſtants, that Romaniſts were increaſing in number. It appeared on that inquiry, that the complaints were ill-founded; that the number of Romaniſts had conſiderably decreaſed in England ſince the Revolution, and that the whole number of Romaniſts in England, when the inquiry was made, did not exceed eighteen thouſand. Adding the population of Great Britain and Ireland together, the Proteſtants will be found to outnumber the Romaniſts at leaſt in the proportion of ſix to one in the Britiſh Empire in Europe; and hence this

author's argument for the eſtabliſhment of Popery and ſubverſion of the Proteſtant religion, on the ſcore of numbers, in any part of the Britiſh European dominions, will be found, like many of his other arguments, to make directly againſt his purpoſe.

As this author could not ſeriouſly entertain the hope, ſanguine as he is, that the rulers of the Britiſh Empire would be duped by his abſurd arguments to overturn the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment in Ireland for the purpoſe of ſubſtituting Popery in its place, he proceeds to allege, that the eſtabliſhment of any religion by the State is utterly unneceſſary, wiſhing at leaſt to deſtroy what his party is hopeleſs of obtaining; and this modern political principle, as he ſtates it, he ſupports by the following aſſertion: *Popery has anſwered all the true purpoſes of religion in Ireland without an eſtabliſhment.* From his confederates, the Atheiſts of France, he has borrowed this modern political principle; but his ſupport of it from the efficacy in Ireland of uneſtabliſhed Popery, alleging that it has anſwered all true purpoſes of religion, is as glaring, as notorious a falſehood, as any contained in his pamphlet, or in any other publication, ancient or modern. The author admits, in the ſame page (40), *that Religion is a great help to Morality, Good Order, and Government.* Let us now examine the effects of Popery in Ireland by this criterion. The Engliſh ſettled in Ireland before the Reformation, were for the moſt part always attached to England: they depended on England for ſupport. A conſtant war was kept up between the Engliſh ſettlers in a conſiderable diſtrict of Ireland, called the Pale, and the native Iriſh: they would not mix or intermarry with them. The native Iriſh and theſe Engliſh

ſettlers

ſettlers and their deſcendants, though inhabiting that part of Ireland for ſome centuries before, remained two diſtinct and ſeparate nations in the ſame iſland, and perſecuting each other, in a predatory and deſtructive war, with the utmoſt rancour; but no ſooner had the Reformation been introduced into Ireland, which it was not with any very material effect till the reign of King James the Firſt, than the natives and theſe Engliſh ſettlers began to unite and form alliances. Their mutual enmity abated, and they joined in a rancorous hatred of the Engliſh nation, and hoſtility to it; the old Engliſh ſettlers growing as inveterate as the native Iriſh againſt the nation from which they ſprung, joining in all ſchemes for ſevering the iſland from England for ever, and rendering it an Independent State. Such a project indeed had been always cheriſhed by the native Iriſh, but was always oppoſed by the Engliſh ſettlers till after the Reformation. From this darling purſuit of the native Iriſh before the Reformation, ſtrengthened by the junction of the Engliſh ſettlers with them after that period, a junction entirely effected by their common attachment to the doctrines of the Romiſh Church; and from ſuch confederacy, cemented by bigotry, and inflamed by religious fury againſt their fellow-ſubjects, ſprung Deſmond's and Tyrone's rebellions in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the horrible rebellion and maſſacre in that of Charles the Firſt, and the obſtinate and deſtructive rebellion in the reign of William and Mary. In each of theſe rebellions the moſt horrible cruelties were exerciſed by the Romiſh inſurgents on all Proteſtants who fell into their hands; and the nation was three times ſucceſſively deſolated, and the Romaniſts, as vanquiſhed rebels, reduced to abject poverty, from which they have not yet emerged. Above one half of the inhabit-

ants, at each time, periſhed by famine and the ſword; multitudes deſerted the kingdom; all improvements were deſtroyed; the progreſs of induſtry was effectually impeded; arts and ſciences were baniſhed; and Ireland, by ſuch means, though intimately connected with the richeſt, moſt civilized and induſtrious nation in the world, is now a century behind the reſt of Europe in civilization and every ſpecies of valuable improvement, all owing to the ſuperſtitious attachment of a conſiderable portion of its inhabitants to the Romiſh faith, in oppoſition to the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment. A large portion of its natives, all Romaniſts, is by the ſame cauſe continued in a ſemi-barbarous ſtate. (See Tone's State of Ireland, for the Uſe of the French Convention.) In ſhort, all the calamities which, for a courſe of two hundred years paſt and upwards, have overwhelmed this unhappy country, in the catalogue of which muſt be included the late rebellion (which this author, with ſufficient confidence, aſſerts was not a Romiſh rebellion), and the murder in cold blood of all Proteſtants who fell into the hands of the inſurgents, have had their real ſource in the Popery of part of the inhabitants of Ireland. *Such is the aſſiſtance which Popery without an eſtabliſhment has afforded to Morality, Good Order, and Government, within this kingdom! and ſuch the true purpoſes of Religion which it has anſwered!*

This author's next poſition is, that the Revenue of the Church is part of the common ſtock left to the diſcretion of the State to employ to the beſt advantage of the *Community*; from whence he deduces that it may juſtly withhold it from the ſupport of the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment; not without throwing out a ſtrong hint of the wiſdom and generoſity of applying it, or at leaſt a part of it, to

the ſupport or eſtabliſhment of Romiſh prieſts in Ireland.

The Revenues and Property of the Church are by the Britiſh Conſtitution juſt as far diſpoſable of by the State as the revenues and property of the Laity, and no further. The State has a right to demand a reaſonable part of the property of all its ſubjects, laity and clergy, by way of tax, for the ſupport of civil and military eſtabliſhments, ſufficient to ſecure the nation in peace at home, and cauſe it to be reſpected by foreign nations, to repel and puniſh their aggreſſions. Until of late years, when the regular ſittings of convocations of the clergy came to be diſcontinued, they taxed themſelves, and were not ſubject to taxation by the Commons. But this author means by his poſition, that the State has a right to ſeize on all the revenues and property of the Church at its pleaſure, and to apply it to what uſe it pleaſes, that is, to confiſcate it. This doctrine he very explicitly avows and maintains in the 31ſt page of his pamphlet. The State, being eſtabliſhed for the protection, and not for the deſtruction of property, has no more right, by the Britiſh Conſtitution, to act in ſuch manner in reſpect to the Church, than it has to ſeize on and confiſcate all the eſtates and property of the Laity; neither has the State, by the ſame Conſtitution, any right to lay any greater tax on eccleſiaſtical than on lay property. Some of our countrymen, who have been educated in France, are conſtantly debaſing our language by introducing Galliciſms into our phraſeology: in the ſame way, thoſe who have learned their politics in the modern French ſchool, are for ever obtruding the ſlagitious, anarchical, political principles of the French Atheiſts upon us, as if they were part of our conſtitu-

tional principles, endeavouring thus to corrupt and debaſe our conſtitution. This author betrays his French inſtitution and politics, and his utter ignorance of the conſtitution of his country, in numberleſs inſtances, one of which is, his doctrine reſpecting the inexpediency and inutility of a church eſtabliſhment, and the juſtice of the confiſcation of all church revenues. Under the influence, or rather pretended influence, of this doctrine, the French Atheiſts robbed their national clergy of all ſupport, and then exterminated them, and all Chriſtianity, with fire and ſword; juſtifying their robbery and ſacrilege by this doctrine; their murders and baniſhments, by the neceſſity of ridding themſelves of the people they had robbed: indeed it has been, in all ages, the practice of French robbers to murder thoſe they have plundered. Such are a few of the unconſtitutional doctrines which this Romiſh writer has publiſhed for the peruſal of the ſubjects of the Britiſh Empire! and ſuch the arguments by which he attempts to recommend and juſtify the ſubverſion of our conſtitution in Church and State, and the erection of Popery on its ruins!

Further to convince my readers, that admiſſion into the Senate and the great offices of the State will not content the Romaniſts, and that they aim at nothing leſs than the overthrow of the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment in Ireland, I will quote ſome of this author's complaints on the ſubject of tithes, almoſt the whole ſupport of the parochial Proteſtant clergy of Ireland; and will at the ſame time note their falſity and malice, thinking this the proper place for doing ſo, as I am expoſing his unfounded aſſertions reſpecting the property of the Church. In page 30 he obſerves, 'The religion of one man out of

'four

'four is Proteſtant. This religion is endowed with the 'tithe of the whole kingdom, beſide great property in 'land, an immenſe church eſtabliſhment.' In page 31 he writes thus: 'Among the peaſantry, the proportion 'of Roman Catholics is much greater (than four to one). 'After paying a tithe, *exacted generally with great rigour*, 'to ſupport the eſtabliſhed religion, of which they never 'hear but by the tithe proctor, they muſt out of their po-'verty pay ſomething to their own prieſt, who, nearly 'as poor as themſelves, lives with them, and renders 'them many ſervices.' In page 56, with reſpect to tithes, he thus expreſſes himſelf: 'This tax, and the 'ſeverity with which it is collected, is one of the great-'eſt grievances the people labour under;' ſo that, according to this writer, the payment of tithes to the Proteſtant clergy by the Iriſh Romaniſts is a grievance to them as heavy at leaſt as excluſion from the Senate and the great offices of the State, and conſequently muſt be alſo redreſſed before they will conſent to an Union. Very happy it is for Proteſtants, and ſufficient to put them on their guard, that theſe Romiſh writers in general, when they plead for an extenſion of privileges to Romaniſts, before a Proteſtant tribunal, are ſo far tranſported by the rancour of their ſect, that they cannot refrain from venting their venom againſt the Proteſtant religion and its paſtors, even by the very intereſt of the ſect whoſe cauſe they are pleading, nor conceal their projects of ſubverſion of the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment on the attainment of theſe privileges, at the very time they are ſoliciting for them; nor their intentions to uſe them, in caſe they ſhall be inveſted with them, for the deſtruction of the very people from whom they are ſoliciting them. Their indiſcreet impetuoſity makes their claims appear

as reaſonable as the ſolicitation of a murderer would be, who ſhould humbly requeſt you to give him your ſword for the purpoſe of plunging it into your heart. I will now proceed to examine the complaints of this writer reſpecting tithes.

In the firſt place he ſtyles Tithes a Tax, to expoſe them to popular odium; the maſs of the people in every country being adverſe to the payment of Taxes. Taxes are certain ſums of money aſſeſſed on, and levied from, the ſubjects of the realm, by the lawful authority of Parliament, to be applied to the ſupport of Government and other public purpoſes. Tithes predial and mixt, the only tithes paid in this kingdom, are certain duties to be paid out of the produce and profits of lands, and beaſts fed on lands, in nature of rent; but to be paid in kind, as all rents were heretofore paid in this nation, before money became ſo plentiful in Europe as in the preſent, and for a few immediately preceding ages. In fact, tithes are a rent with which all the lands in the kingdom are chargeable, for time immemorial, by the common law of the realm; and the clergy have been endowed with them by a title more ancient by ages than the title of any ſubject of this or any other kingdom in Europe, to his particular landed eſtate. The only difference between tithes as a rent, and the rent of any man's landed eſtate, is, that the rents reſerved on landed eſtates in this kingdom are certain ſums of money to be paid in lieu of a ſhare of the produce; and tithes are an uncertain duty, being one tenth of the produce payable in kind, and therefore varying in quantity every year, as the crop varies, being greater or leſs, as the crop is greater or leſs annually. Every perſon whoſe lands are ſubject to tithes,

tithes, if he purchaſed the lands himſelf, bought them ſubject to the duty or rent of tithes; if he inherited them from his anceſtors, the purchaſing anceſtor, whoever he was, took them ſubject to the payment of tithes: from hence may be diſcovered either the ignorance or malice of this author, or both, in ſtyling tithes a tax. He next ſtates, *that this tax (that is, tithes) is exacted with great rigour and ſeverity.* This is a very direct and impudent falſehood; and as this writer has himſelf a landed eſtate in Ireland, it is a falſehood to his own knowledge. It is a fact too well known to every landholder in this kingdom, that the Iriſh Proteſtant clergy in general do not receive above one-fifth part of what they are by law entitled to, of the value of their tithes; that is, one fiftieth part of the annual value of the produce of the lands, *to the tithe of which they are entitled:* for one third of the tithe of the whole kingdom is in lay hands, and many parts of it are exempt from the payment of any tithes whatſoever; the Proteſtant Diſſenters, as well as the Romaniſts, pay tithes with great reluctance; and the clergyman, haraſſed with ſuits and chicane, is glad to accept of a very inadequate compoſition for his tithes, even in pariſhes where he is beſt paid. No perſonal tithes are paid in any part of Ireland, or demanded; and as for mixt tithes, they are paid very partially. The only ſpecies of them which is paid in any part of Ireland, is tithe of lamb and wool. Tithe of agiſtment, or tithe of milk in dairies, are never demanded or paid, though payable by the common law. No perſon in Ireland is better qualified to inform the public in general, on the ſubject of the collection of tithes, and the conduct of the eſtabliſhed clergy in Ireland in that particular, than I am, from the nature of my profeſſion and the offices I fill;

fill; and I can with the greateſt truth aver, that the moderation of the eſtabliſhed Clergy in Ireland, in the collection of their tithes, is unparalleled, when compared with the conduct of any other ſet of men in enforcing the ſatisfaction of their legal demands; particularly when the very ſcanty proviſion which the parochial Clergy in general in this kingdom have, is conſidered; the whole benefices in the nation, reputing each union one benefice, amounting only to about eight hundred, and the incumbents of at leaſt one half of them are not paid an income of two hundred pounds per annum; and of the other half, there is a moiety whoſe incomes, actually paid, do not exceed three hundred pounds per annum each; and throughout the kingdom it has become neceſſary for the Biſhops to unite a number of pariſhes, to enſure even a reaſonable ſubſiſtence for a clergyman. The whole eſtabliſhed Clergy of Ireland do not amount to more than one thouſand three hundred; and were the whole revenues of the Church, of every nature, divided equally among them, each man would not receive more than about one hundred and fifty pounds per annum. This the author, in page 31, ſtyles *an immenſe church eſtabliſhment;* and inſolently adds, that no one can ſay it is *neceſſary or uſeful in general to the people of the country.* Such is the grievance people labour under from the ſeverity with which Tithes are collected in Ireland, and the immenſity of the Church Eſtabliſhment, according to this author: it is, like his other pretended grievances, a lying invention of a malignant Iriſh Romaniſt.

His next complaint reſpecting tithes is, that the Romiſh peaſantry, very poor from oppreſſion, are obliged to pay them to the Proteſtant clergy, whoſe ſpiritual aſſiſtance

aſſiſtance they receive not; and are at the ſame time obliged to contribute to the ſupport of their own clergy for ſpiritual aſſiſtance they do receive from them; that is, the Iriſh Romiſh peaſantry pay the Proteſtant clergy by compulſion, without valuable conſideration; the Romiſh clergy by juſtice, for valuable conſideration. Before I expoſe the falſity of this complaint, it may not be amiſs to ſhow the injuſtice of it. In every country in which there is an Eſtabliſhed Religion, the people at large are obliged to contribute to the ſupport of the miniſters of it; and it is but reaſonable that they ſhould do ſo, if a Church Eſtabliſhment be neceſſary and uſeful in a State; which all people, French philoſophers excepted, admit. If any part of the ſubjects of a State diſſent from the eſtabliſhment (as is the caſe, more or leſs, in all Chriſtian ſtates), reject the aſſiſtance of the miniſters of the eſtabliſhment in ſpiritual concerns, and apply to miniſters of their own ſelection for that purpoſe, it may be reaſonable that they ſhould pay thoſe whom they have ſo ſelected; but there is not the ſmalleſt juſt or reaſonable ground for complaint, inaſmuch as the miniſters of the Eſtabliſhed Church are ready to afford them ſpiritual aid, and to perform their appointed duty to them, as well as to the other ſubjects, if they chooſe to accept of their miniſtry. So much for the injuſtice of the complaint, ſuppoſing the matter of it were true. But the whole is founded on falſehood and ſophiſtry; for the peaſantry do not pay tithe out of their own property, it is in fact paid by the landlords. The peaſant takes a leaſe of his farm from the proprietor, ſubject to the payment of tithe; and the landlord abates more than an equivalent for the annual tithe, in the yearly rent reſerved payable to himſelf. Lands in Ireland which are tithe-free are let at an

annual

annual rent from a crown to half a crown per acre more than lands which are ſubject to tithes; and in no part of the kingdom does the annual tithe, as it is paid, amount to ſo much on an average as the abatement in the annual rent amounts to; ſo that, though the farmer pays the tithe, yet he does not pay it out of his own pocket,—it is really and *bona fide* paid out of the pocket of the landlord; and the farmer in that reſpect is but his ſteward, and pays for him, and on his account. Of the landed eſtates in Ireland, on the moſt critical examination, it appears that forty-nine parts out of fifty are in the hands of Proteſtants; ſo that Proteſtants pay forty-nine parts out of fifty of the tithe payable to the Proteſtant clergy: the Romiſh farmers do not pay a ſixpence of it on their own accounts, and Romiſh landlords not above a fiftieth part. Every perſon acquainted with the true ſtate of the kingdom knows the truth of the above ſtatement. The Iriſh peaſantry, in fact, would be in a worſe condition if tithes were aboliſhed; for they would be obliged to pay an increaſe of their annual rents for their farms in ſuch an event, vaſtly exceeding the ſums which they now pay for the tithe of them; and this is expreſsly admitted by Mr. Emmett, one of the Iriſh Directory, in his examination on oath before the Secret Committee of the Iriſh Houſe of Lords. See the Appendix to their Report, No. 6, p. 32, where Mr. Emmett ſtates thus: '*I am very ſure, if tithes were aboliſhed, the people, on 'taking new leaſes, would be obliged to pay more in proportion for lands than the value they now pay for tithes*;' but he admits the leaders of the rebellion endeavoured to raiſe a popular cry for the abolition of tithes, as they did in favour of *Catholic Emancipation and Reform*, about all which, he admits, the people did not care a feather, till they

they perſuaded them that certain imaginary advantages were to reſult from them; and that they, that is, the Iriſh Republicans, raiſed that popular cry, for the mere purpoſe of cajoling the maſs of the people into a ſupport of their own anarchical projects.

It may be clearly perceived, that this writer has the ſame purpoſe in view, by all his falſehoods and miſrepreſentations; and that he dwells on old ſubjects of complaint fraudulently aggravated, ariſing from the Popery code, long ſince repealed; on exaggerated accounts of the poverty and miſery of the Iriſh peaſantry, ariſing, as he aſſerts, from oppreſſion, but really from repeated rebellions and diſaffection; on falſe ſtatements reſpecting tithes, ſevere exaction of them, and immenſe revenues in the poſſeſſion of the Iriſh Proteſtant Clergy; and, in ſhort, that he leaves no topic of inflammation, which can work on the paſſions of the Iriſh Romaniſts, either from the deep impreſſions of their bigotry or intereſt, untouched, for the purpoſe of goading them to inſurrection and rebellion, and thereby eſſentially ſerving *his maſters the French Convention.*

This author admits, that the Pope nominates all the Iriſh Roman biſhops, but aſſerts 'that this gives him no 'real or eſſential juriſdiction in the Iriſh ſtate, he and 'the whole Roman Catholic Church not having, nor 'pretending to have, in the Iriſh ſtate the power of the 'meaneſt veſtry.' How far this aſſertion is practically true, let any man judge, who has read the Oath of Allegiance taken by all Romiſh biſhops to the Pope at their conſecration, which I have already ſet forth. It is very true the Romiſh biſhops have no tribunals in Ireland, in which

which they pronounce decrees, the execution of which they can compel by the laws of the land, as they at preſent ſtand: yet it is equally true, that they have tribunals, vicars general and officials who do make and pronounce decrees in what they call ſpiritual matters, and in matrimonial cauſes eſpecially, which highly affect the temporal concerns of the ſubjects of this realm; and that they have ways and means of enforcing, and do enforce, the effectual execution of ſuch decrees, of which I have within theſe few years come to the knowledge, in many inſtances: and although ſuch their proceedings are forbidden by the laws of the realm under ſevere penalties, yet they continue the practice, have ſeals of office, and levy no inconſiderable ſums on the ſubject for licences, diſpenſations, and other incidents of epiſcopal juriſdiction. If Romaniſts ſhould be admitted to a ſhare of the ſupreme authority of the State, and if any attempt ſhould be made to carry the laws into execution againſt ſuch illegal practices, what loud complaints ſhould we hear of perſecution! and what harangues of Romiſh orators would be pronounced in the Senate on the ſcore of the obſtruction of the juriſdiction of their Biſhops, liegemen of the Pope, in matters very intimately connected with the temporal intereſts of the ſubject! and how inceſſant would their endeavours be to procure the repeal of ſuch wholeſome and reſtrictive ſtatutes!

This author obſerves, 'that the Statute of Magna 'Charta, the foundation of civil liberty, and the Statute 'of Præmunire (2d of Richard the Second), which ſe-'cured eccleſiaſtical liberty, were acts of Roman Catholic 'Parliaments.' It is to be noted, however, that the Statute of Magna Charta eſtabliſhed all the uſurpations of the Romiſh

Romiſh Church as they then ſtood (See chap. i. xxxiii. xxxviii. of it: 2d Coke's Inſtitutes, page 2. 68. 76.), and only repreſſed and aboliſhed prerogatives claimed by the Crown, which bore hard on an Ariſtocracy, clerical and lay, at that time of mighty power; and that the ſtatute of Richard the Second only went to reſtrain the introduction into the kingdom of the Pope's bulls which touched on *the King's Crown and Regality*, or his realm, and the execution of ſuch: the Popedom at that time claiming, and attempting to exerciſe, an unlimited temporal authority within the realm, and uſurping all the prerogatives of the Crown, which abuſes it had principally introduced in the reign of King John. The ſtatute did abrogate, or attempt to abrogate, the ſupremacy of the Pope in ſpirituals, and in all temporal matters incident to ſuch ſpiritual ſupremacy: the authority of the Pope in ſpirituals and in temporals inſeparably connected with them, remained unimpaired in the realm, and was executed therein, either by his own or the Biſhop's officers, or by the officers of the Sovereign, notwithſtanding that ſtatute, as may be learned from our hiſtories, till the time of Henry the Eighth: Richard's Parliament not deſigning to curtail, what they, being Romaniſts, believed to be the juſt portion of temporal power incident to the Pope's acknowledged ſupremacy in ſpirituals. Till the reign of Henry the Eighth appeals to Rome, though illegal before, had been always connived at. (See 4th vol. Blackſtone's Commentaries, page 114.)

The concluding argument of this author for the admiſſion of Romaniſts into the Senate, and into all places of truſt and confidence within the realm, to wit, *a ſimilar practice in many other States*, he introduces with an affecta-

tion of great politeneſs: his politeneſs indeed is much of the ſame kind with that of ſome modern men of nice honour, who affect all kind of ceremonious delicacy in their conduct, preparative to a premeditated quarrel, and mean to procure an excuſe for ſhooting a man through the head, or running him through the heart, with the moſt perfect good breeding: he thus addreſſes the gentleman whoſe arguments he has undertaken to anſwer: 'I am almoſt 'afraid of being accuſed of impoliteneſs by adducing no-'torious facts, which may look like groſs and blunt con-'tradictions of the aſſertions of a gentleman, who ought 'to have ſuch good information upon the ſubject he treats.' Before I proceed to the examination of the inſtances of the practice of other States, in reſpect to the indiſcriminate diſtribution of honours, emoluments, and confidential offices in the civil and military departments, on Proteſtants and Romaniſts (inſtances almoſt all confined to Germany), which are adduced by this *ſoi-diſant* well-informed writer, I muſt remark, that the Government of every one of them is deſpotic, and either in the hands of a ſingle perſon, or in thoſe of an oligarchy; and that the people at large have no ſhare in the ſupreme power of the ſtate; that is, their Governments have no democracy intermixed with them: no aſſembly, elected by the people for a certain term, and whoſe members at its expiration become part of the maſs of the people, forms part of their ſovereignties; and no arguments deduced from the practice in ſuch States in the particulars above-mentioned will apply to a Government partly democratic, and the moſt efficient part of which is ſuch a popular aſſembly as above deſcribed. In ſuch States any particular religious tenet held by a part of the people, hoſtile to the principles of Government, can have but a very ſmall miſchievous effect: many civil and

all military offices may be diſpoſed of by ſuch deſpotic governments to any perſons they may think capable of ſerving them, without regard to their religious perſuaſions, and without inconvenience to the ſyſtem of government; for ſuch officers can have no ſhare or influence in the government, except through the medium of their deſpotic maſters, who can diſmiſs them at their pleaſure. In a Romiſh deſpotic government, the employment of Proteſtants in great and confidential offices can be of no public inconvenience, as well for the before-mentioned reaſon, as becauſe there is no tenet of the Proteſtant religion which teaches the perſecution of all Chriſtians, princes and people, differing from Proteſtants in point of doctrine, as heretics with fire and ſword; no tenet which teaches them to overturn the government which does not ſhare its ſovereignty with a foreign tribunal. It is much ſafer for a Romiſh State to employ Proteſtants in great offices, than for a Proteſtant State to employ Romaniſts.

The Saxon State œconomy this author produces with a ſort of triumphant exultation, as a deciſive proof of the truth of his deductions; 'he ſtates it to be a Roman Ca-
'tholic government in a Proteſtant country, the very re-
'verſe of Ireland: to make the contraſt complete, Pro-
'teſtant and Catholic enjoy every privilege without diſ-
'tinction. *The revenue of the Church, ſmall but adequate,*
'*is given to thoſe who do the ſervice of it in either way.*
'The peaſantry are without any exception the happieſt,
'moſt comfortable, and moſt contented in the world;
'the higher ranks remarkable for their martial and ho-
'nourable ſpirit, the Sovereign is a father of all his ſub-
'jects. But a ſtronger and more extraordinary fact re-

'mains, to confound the friends and abettors of religious 'jealouſy and animoſity. The Proteſtants of Germany, 'certainly not indifferent to the intereſts of their religion, 'could not find a properer perſon to entruſt them to, than 'to this very Roman Catholic Prince, who is ſelected by 'themſelves to be the chief of the Proteſtant Union, and 'to watch over the treaties made in their favour.

But this well-informed author, notwithſtanding the amazing extent of his knowledge, ſeems to be totally ignorant of the ſpecific differences of the conſtitution of the Britiſh Empire from that of any other country in the world, and the neceſſary political effects of ſuch differences in the internal regulations of a State, one efficient part of whoſe ſovereignty is a popular aſſembly, when contraſted with the internal political regulations of a deſpotic government. The Elector of Saxony is as deſpotic a prince as any in Europe within his own territories; his ſubjects, in a political ſenſe, are complete ſlaves; there is no ſpice of democracy mingled with his power: in his State the Sovereign may be truly called the father of his people, in the ſame ſenſe that the author of '*Killing no Murder*,' gives that title to Cromwell. 'Your 'Highneſs,' ſays he, '*is the true father of your people, for we* '*have nothing during your life that we can call our own.*' If the ſubjects of this Elector, the higheſt ranks, as well as the peaſantry, are the happieſt and moſt contented in Europe, as this author ſtates, it muſt follow that abject political ſlavery is productive of the greateſt happineſs to the ſubject; a doctrine which will not be reliſhed by the ſubjects of the Britiſh Empire: God preſerve us from ſuch happineſs! I remember an inſtance of the Elector of Saxony's mild government of his ſubjects, which was publiſhed

publiſhed throughout Europe above thirty years ago. He received information that a Saxon peaſant had killed a deer; he cauſed him to be ſeized, ſtripped naked, pinioned, and ſtrongly tied on the back of a ſtag, which was immediately turned looſe into the foreſts: the wild animal, affrighted, and rather uneaſy under ſo arbitrary an impoſition, ran furiouſly through the woods, till the unhappy rider was torn to pieces by the projecting branches of trees, and the thorny brambles of the wild.

At the firſt dawning of the Reformation in Germany, the then Elector of Saxony, one of the moſt potent princes of the Germanic Union, became the profeſſed patron of Luther; he protected him from the fury of the Romaniſts, and himſelf as well as his ſubjects became Proteſtants, as did many other German potentates with their people. The Emperor, at the inſtigation of the Pope, and other Romiſh eccleſiaſtics, commenced a furious war againſt theſe Proteſtants; it raged with great violence for many years, and incalculable miſchief was done to both parties; the Elector of Saxony, as the moſt conſiderable Proteſtant prince, being at the head of the Proteſtants: till at length both ſides, wearied and waſted by the calamities of war, entered into treaties of peace; the Elector of Saxony, then a Proteſtant, being ſelected by his Proteſtant co-eſtates as chief of the Union. (See Robertſon's Hiſtory of Charles the Fifth, vol. ii. book ii. page 100.; book v. page 352. 355.; vol. iii. book x. p. 201. octavo edition.) About the beginning of the preſent century, the then Elector of Saxony apoſtatized from the religion of his anceſtors, and became a Romaniſt, his ſubjects being Proteſtants; and his ſucceſſors have continued Romaniſts to this day. The anceſtor of the Elector of Saxony, being a Proteſtant, was by the before-mentioned treaties acknowledged chief of

the Proteſtant Germanic Union; but all Germany knows that the preſent Elector, being a Romaniſt, is not conſidered or acknowledged as ſuch, though the treaties exiſt; and that he could not be conſidered as ſuch, even if he were a Proteſtant, becauſe he is infinitely inferior in power to the King of Pruſſia, Elector of Brandenburgh, who is now in fact the head of the Proteſtant Germanic Union, and is ſo conſidered.

The Elector of Saxony being a deſpotic, in reſpect to his conſtitutional authority over his own ſubjects, is yet a dependant prince in reſpect to the Emperor and his coeſtates, being but a member of the German Empire: hence he cannot attempt to innovate in the eſtabliſhed religion of his country, and ſubſtitute the Romiſh faith in the room of the Proteſtant, becauſe the Proteſtant States of the Empire would certainly interfere to prevent him, and would be obliged by the above-mentioned treaties to do ſo: his ſubjects, ſecured in the enjoyment of their religious eſtabliſhment by the conſtitution of the German Empire, and their religion teaching them no doctrines hoſtile to their Romiſh Sovereign, acquieſce under the government of a Romaniſt: and as to the enjoyment of every privilege indiſcriminately by Proteſtant and Romaniſt, very little miſchief is to be apprehended on that account in a State, where the Sovereign is deſpotic, and the people entitled to no privilege, ſave what the Sovereign pleaſes to beſtow: benefits ſpringing entirely from his favour cannot with propriety be called privileges.

The above reaſoning applies to every inſtance quoted by this author of the indiſcriminate advancement of Romaniſts and Proteſtants under the German governments; but he is not able to quote one inſtance of ſuch indiſcriminate

criminate advancement in any popular government in Chriſtendom : the Swiſs States were almoſt all oligarchical, and very deſpotic : and in the Dutch State, which had a great mixture of democracy in it, and which held out univerſal toleration and protection to the profeſſors of all ſects, no perſon of a different religious perſuaſion from that of their eſtabliſhment, before the French ſubverted their conſtitution, was ſuffered to ſit as a member of their States General.

This author, with no ſmall degree of ſophiſtry and aſſurance coupled together, obſerves, that the Saxon government is the direct reverſe of that of Ireland, for there the government (that is, the Elector) is Roman Catholic, and the country Proteſtant; thus indirectly aſſerting, that the religion of the people of Ireland in general is Romiſh, though the government be Proteſtant. The truth is, the religion of the people of Ireland, if determined by the religion of the majority reckoned by the poll, would be Romiſh by a majority of two to one : if reckoned by property, would be Proteſtant by a majority of forty to one ; ſo that it may be juſtly aſſerted from fair calculation, excluſive of its being the one eſtabliſhed, that the religion of Ireland is Proteſtant. The author does not forget to inſinuate in his account of Saxony, that Romiſh Iriſh prieſts ſhould enjoy part at leaſt of the revenue of the Church in Ireland, by obſerving, that in Saxony the *ſmall* but *adequate* revenue of the Church is given to thoſe who do the ſervice of it in either way : which obſervation, however, is falſe with reſpect to that electorate in general. And this author's *extraordinary fact confounding all his oppoſers* turns out to be a fabrication of his own, the materials of which are fraud and ignorance.

This author attempts to furniſh an argument in favour of his poſitions, from the liberality of the French monarchical government to their Proteſtant ſubjects: he aſſerts, 'that the Proteſtants in thoſe parts of France 'where they were in any proportion to the Catholics, 'were exactly in the ſame ſituation as they. Such was 'the caſe of Alſatia ceded to France by the treaty of 'Munſter; the rights of Proteſtants in that province were 'reſpected.' Alſace was no part of the realm of France, it was a part of Germany acquired by the arms and treachery of the French monarch: the inhabitants were Proteſtants. A treaty of peace being concluded between France and Germany, and this province ceded to France, the free exerciſe of the religion of the inhabitants was ſtipulated for, and made one of the conditions of the treaty; as the province bordered on the territories of the enemies of France, and might revolt, the French Government thought it prudent to reconcile the inhabitants to their new maſters, by an adherence to the treaty ſo far as to indulge them in the free exerciſe of their religion: it was uſeful to the French to do ſo; and could not be detrimental, inaſmuch as the people of the province have no ſhare in the government, which is deſpotic: a ſort of political neceſſity inſured the obſervation of the treaty, otherwiſe it may be fairly preſumed, that this moſt faithleſs of all nations would not have heſitated at violating the conditions. The conduct of that nation in violating the Edict of Nants, and perſecuting the Proteſtants throughout all their ancient limits, in the true ſpirit of Popery, with fire, ſword, and the gallies, particularly in Languedoc, where they continued to hunt them like wild beaſts, till the diſſolution of the monarchy, fully juſtifies ſuch a preſumption.

The

The author then ſtates, ‘ that Mr. Neckar, who was ‘ Prime Miniſter, Marechal Saxe many years Com- ‘ mander in Chief of the armies in France, Marechals ‘ Lovendal, Luckner, Wurmſer, and innumerable other ‘ Proteſtants, were high in civil and military rank in ‘ France.’ I have already ſhown, that, as to the ſecurity of government and the religion eſtabliſhed, it is but of little moment what the religious perſuaſion of military officers is in deſpotic monarchies, as was that of France; and that the religion even of civil officers in ſuch governments is not a matter of much public concern: yet I deny that there were innumerable inſtances in France before the Revolution, of Proteſtants being high in civil or military rank: the inſtances of that kind were very few, and the author has enumerated the moſt of them. But what infatuation induced him to reſort to the inſtance of Mr. Neckar, a Proteſtant, being Prime Miniſter of France? He was indeed Prime Miniſter of that devoted country, and was by reputation a Calviniſt, but in truth, an Atheiſt; and the fruits of his miniſtry in France were, the overthrow of its ancient government, the ſubverſion of its eſtabliſhed religion and of all Chriſtianity, and the deſolation of the kingdom. And this author holds up the fatal promotion in France of this monſter of perfidy and treaſon, an enemy to the eſtabliſhed religion and conſtitution of that country, as an argument to induce Iriſh Proteſtants to betray the ſovereignty of the State into the hands of Iriſh Romaniſts, the inveterate enemies of its eſtabliſhed Religion and Conſtitution.

This author, in page 39, makes the following obſervation: ‘ One cannot help pitying a government, which ‘ ſeems to be in conſtant terror of the proſperity of its ‘ own

'own ſubjects. Their number, their riches, their ſpirit, 'their civil and military talents, are ſo many objects of 'fear.' This is his picture of the government of Ireland! The Iriſh government has uſed every endeavour which ſound policy can dictate, to increaſe the proſperity of all its ſubjects: their number, their riches, their ſpirit, their civil and military talents, are the objects of its applauſes, of its proud and honourable exultation: but a certain claſs of Iriſh ſubjects are, from religious bigotry, incurable enemies to the conſtitution of their country in Church and State; ſound policy directs, that ſuch ſhould be excluded from the ſovereign power of the State, which they muſt wield, if inveſted with it, for the ſubverſion of the conſtitution; and prevented from uſing either their number, their riches, their ſpirit, or their talents, for the ruin of their fellow-ſubjects and of the conſtitution. The Iriſh Proteſtants fear not Iriſh Romaniſts, either from their boaſted numbers or puiſſance; they know their own ſtrength, and rely on their own courage, of both which they have given Romiſh Rebels recent proofs; their conduct in ſuch excluſion is not the effect of fear, but of wiſdom and prudence: it is not cowardice in the garriſon of an impregnable fortreſs, the ſafety and protection of a realm, to refuſe entrance into it to their irreconcilable enemies, whoſe numbers or courage, when on the outſide, can be no objects of terror. How can it be ſaid with juſtice or reaſon, that Iriſh Proteſtants put any impediments in the road of Iriſh Romaniſts to wealth and proſperity, or in their paths to military renown? Is not the army now open to them? Are not trade, and all the avenues of honeſt induſtry, as open to them, as to their Proteſtant fellow-ſubjects? Are not their lives and properties equally protected by the laws? How falſe then, how malicious,

how

how infolent, and how petulant, is the above invective of this Romiſh writer againſt the Iriſh Government!

I will now point the reader's attention to thoſe parts of the author's pamphlet, in which he throws out the moſt audacious threats of rebellion and reſiſtance againſt the lawful authority of the State. Theſe he introduces under the guiſe of advice, or ſuggeſts them as the natural conſequences of what he ſtyles the oppreſſion of the Romaniſts in Ireland by their Proteſtant fellow-ſubjects and the State. In pages 6, 7, and 8, he obſerves, 'that it 'is dangerous, in the preſent ſtate of men's minds all 'over the world, to exclude formally three millions out 'of four, in a detached country, from the juſt and rea-'ſonable rights which they ſee their fellow ſubjects en-'joy; and that the idea of preſerving ſuch an eſtabliſh-'ment by force is abſurd and impracticable.' And then, after obſerving on the ſucceſs of the Netherlands in throwing off the Spaniſh yoke, and their right to do ſo, *he inſinuates that in Ireland, Separation from Great Britain, and Independency, ſhould be maintained at all hazards;* and concludes with the maxim of one of the French demagogues, *that inſurrection is the moſt ſacred of our duties*; pretending to deduce the juſtice of theſe treaſonable aphoriſms from a paſſage in the pamphlet of his antagoniſt.

Further to ſtimulate the Iriſh Romaniſts to rebellion, and to ſharpen their natural rancour againſt the Britiſh ſoldiery, he accuſes the Engliſh Militia, who gallantly volunteered for the aſſiſtance of their brethren the Proteſtants of Ireland, of gratifying their luſt by brutal violations of the Iriſh females, in the following paſſage:

'*From*

'*From accounts which the papers give of the gallantry of the Britiſh Militia with the fair, as well as in the field, one would imagine they had read Mr. C.'s pamphlet, and were imitating the Romans in ſettling the preliminaries of union with the Sabines.*' The good conduct and ſtrict diſcipline of the Britiſh Militia, which lately came into Ireland, have been praiſed by the two Houſes of Parliament, and by every loyal man in the kingdom; and for this moſt groundleſs calumny the ſlanderous author had no other authority than his own malice. He then proceeds, with the utmoſt virulence, to abuſe the policy of Great Britain in reſpect to foreign nations, aſſerting that ſhe has thereby ruined herſelf, and is now a bankrupt, with which it would be highly imprudent for Ireland to have any connexion. He lays to the charge of her Miniſtry all the calamities which, as he ſtates, have afflicted Ireland for a ſeries of ages; and aſſerts that the dawn of improvement in the ſtate of Ireland commenced with her aſſerting ſome degree of independence on England in the year 1780. (See pages 9, 10.) Then, after ſtyling the Proteſtant Religion a Meduſa's head, which paralyſes a large portion of our people, *or turns their arms againſt each other* (thereby admitting, what he in other places denies, that the laſt Rebellion, as well as preceding ones, was a Romiſh rebellion), he recites the triumphs of the Republic of France, and magnifies her power: he ſtates, *that a war between Great Britain and Ireland is not probable, if the people are ſatisfied; but is to be feared, if the cauſes of diſcontent are not removed.* By the people, this author, throughout his pamphlet, means Romaniſts excluſively; and the principal cauſes of complaint which he enumerates, are the excluſion of the members of the Romiſh ſect from Parliament, and from the great offices

of the State; that is, from a ſhare in the ſovereignty of the State; thus declaring in the moſt explicit terms, *that the Iriſh Romaniſts will commence hoſtilities againſt Great Britain and the Proteſtants of Ireland, in confederacy with France, if they do not obtain a ſhare in the ſovereignty.* (See page 17.) He further proceeds thus: 'It is dangerous, it is almoſt treaſon againſt the cauſe of all 'regular ſociety, *attacked as it is by powerful enemies*, to 'trifle in this manner with the feelings of three millions 'of people, by excluding them from thoſe rights for 'which they are called upon to riſk their lives.' (See page 23.) Then, after acknowledging that the late Iriſh Rebels, forming the Directory, were in treaty with France for their aſſiſtance to ſeparate Ireland from Great Britain, and praiſing this Directory for their principles of patriotiſm manifeſted in the conduct of the treaty, he proceeds to encourage rebellion, by inſinuating the probability of ſucceſs, from the ſituation of Ireland, and the certainty of French ſupport. 'Of late,' he obſerves, 'the theory of inſurrection has 'almoſt forced itſelf upon every ſpeculative mind. A 'province diſtant from the ſeat of empire is much more 'liable to the intrigues of an enemy than one that has it 'in its centre.' (See page 24.) He proceeds in pretty much the ſame ſtrain to page 30, in which he inſerts a quotation from Mariana, importing, that all poor perſons in a State will be enemies to it, if all hopes of emerging are taken away from them; which may be very true, but gives no ſupport to the author's arguments. Mariana does not mean that all beggars in a State will rebel, if the hope of emerging into the ſovereignty of the State is taken away from them; he means the hope of emerging into opulence: ſuch is the preciſe meaning of the paſ-

ſage.

ſage. But the means of emerging from poverty into opulence are, by our Conſtitution, as open to poor Romaniſts as to poor Proteſtants. The author ſeems to have inſerted the quotation for the mere purpoſe of ſhowing his learning: it cannot be diſtorted to ſignify that beggars will be diſaffected to the State, unleſs they have grounds to hope that they may be kings.

This author, then, for the mere purpoſe of inflammation, falls on the Iriſh Popery Code, which has been ſome time ſince, perhaps injudiciouſly, certainly too haſtily, repealed. He thus deſcribes it and its effects: 'Laws which for a century cramped the induſtry of a 'people, debarred them from education, armed the 'brother againſt the brother, and rewarded the ſon for 'betraying the father, excluded the Roman Catholics 'from Proteſtant ſchools, prevented them from having 'ſchools of their own, and proſcribed foreign education.' (See pages 4. 10.) 'Theſe laws left a people poor, ig-'norant, with little reſpect for law, and ferocious from 'a ſenſe of injury. They rendered property inſecure, 'prevented the cultivation of land, the interior con-'fidence of families, the extenſion of trade, or the em-'ployment of the talents or genius of three fourths of 'the people in civil or military affairs.' (See page 34.) At preſent I ſhall only obſerve, that England had her Popery Code as well as Ireland, very ſimilar to, and almoſt the ſame with the Iriſh; and that this Code, though the Iriſh one be repealed, is ſtill in force, as to many parts of it, in England. I ſhall hereafter make further obſervations on this author's ſtrictures on the Iriſh Popery Code; but ſhall firſt ſhow that the ſtrength and puiſſance of the Iriſh Romaniſts are not ſo great or formidable,

formidable, nor their threatened rebellion, even though ſupported by France, ſo dangerous to the Iriſh Government, or to the Britiſh Empire in general, as this author repreſents them. In the ſecond place, I ſhall prove that the late Iriſh Rebellion was a Romiſh Rebellion: in doing which I ſhall be obliged to delineate ſome of the cruelties exerciſed by the Rebels on their Proteſtant fellow-ſubjects. In the third place, I ſhall ſhow that all the rebellions of Iriſh Romaniſts are excited, encouraged, and even commanded, by the poſitive tenets of their religion: from whence it will directly follow as a corollary, that the maſs of Iriſh Romaniſts, as long as they continue of that perſuaſion, muſt be juſtly conſidered by the State as ſubjects whoſe fidelity cannot be relied upon; and that ſuch checks ſhould be held over them as may prevent their diſturbing the State, even after an Incorporating Union ſhall take place.

As to the firſt, I have already proved, that Iriſh Romaniſts do not exceed Iriſh Proteſtants in number, in a greater proportion than that of two to one; and this proof I have founded on every rational ground of inquiry or inveſtigation, which have in that particular been ever adopted. (See Appendix, No. 1.) I have already ſhown, as to the maſs of property in Ireland, real and perſonal, that the part of it in the hands of Proteſtants is to that in the hands of Romaniſts in the proportion of forty to one. (See Appendix, No. 1.) Now as the ſtrength of a nation, for defence and offence, is in a ratio compoſed of its numbers and its wealth, ſo likewiſe is the relative ſtrength of two contending parties within it: hence it is demonſtrable, that the Proteſtants of Ireland alone are fully able to repreſs the threatened rebellion of the Iriſh Romaniſts;

and

and this was fully and practically proved in the late Romiſh Rebellion, which was ſuppreſſed by the Army, Militia, and Proteſtant Yeomanry of Ireland.

It is well known in Ireland, that this Rebellion might have been prevented and nipped in the bud, if vigorous meaſures had been timely adopted by the Iriſh Government. The then Lord Lieutenant (Earl Camden) was a man of great honour and integrity, and a determined friend to the Conſtitution in Church and State. The principal men in power in the kingdom were of ſimilar character. The information reſpecting the ſchemes and deſigns of the conſpirators was complete, and called for the moſt ſpeedy and ſtrenuous exertions of the State to defeat them. The Iriſh Parliament conferred the moſt ample authority on the Executive Government; yet the delay of exertion was remarkable and notorious. Moſt thinking people attributed the backwardneſs of Government in ſeizing and puniſhing theſe Catholics, and their aſſociates, to a Britiſh influence in our councils. It is ſuppoſed that the powers of the Chief Governor were ſhackled by orders from England. The ſtate of affairs in Ireland had been groſsly miſrepreſented to men in power in England, and theſe miſrepreſentations had taken deep root. The late Mr. *Edmund Burke*, an Iriſh gentleman reſident in England, had projected the total ſubverſion of the Proteſtant Eſtabliſhment in Ireland ſo early as the year 1761; and having ingratiated himſelf with the Secretary of the Marquis of Halifax, then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, he returned to his native country in his ſuite. He then began his operations for carrying his project into execution. He found, however, the current of opinion in Ireland againſt his innovations

innovations too ſtrong for his ſtemming it. England was at that time triumphant over France, and no aſſiſtance was to be expected from that quarter; and his own credit in England was not then near ſo great as it afterwards was. He was obliged to ſuſpend his operations at that time, and retire unſucceſsful to England. As ſoon, however, as the American war blazed forth, he recommenced them with all the vigour in his power. He publiſhed a Letter, addreſſed to a Romiſh Iriſh Nobleman, which is exactly of the ſame nature with the pamphlet I am now remarking on: indeed all the arguments in this pamphlet are taken from the Letter. Mr. Burke therein paints in the moſt glowing colours, the hardſhips which Romaniſts endured in Ireland from the effect of the Popery Laws; he boldly aſſerts their undoubted right to every privilege enjoyed by Iriſh Proteſtants; he exaggerates their number and ſtrength, and threatens the Britiſh Empire with the exertion of them againſt its then tottering power, as he deſcribes it: in ſhort, he dwells on every topic of inflammation of Iriſh Romaniſts, on every encouragement, on every provocation to revolt againſt Britain in her then diſtreſſed ſituation; mixing, throughout the whole, the groſſeſt miſrepreſentations of the ſtate of Ireland. This Letter he followed with a ſucceſſion of publications, all in the ſame ſtrain, under the titles of Letters, Speeches, and Eſſays, in the daily Newſpapers, Reviews, Magazines, Annual Regiſters, &c. and continued them to the day of his death. His parents were Iriſh Romaniſts; he was endowed with very ſhowy talents; his ſtyle was elegant; he was well read in all parts of polite literature; he was laborious and indefatigable: but his vanity, the attendant on a weak judgment, was unbounded; and his zeal for

promoting all the political views of Popery was enthuſiaſtic. This zeal will account for the extraordinary anomalies in his political conduct. He had recommended himſelf to the late Marquis of Rockingham, and by his intereſt he obtained a ſeat in the Britiſh Houſe of Commons. During the American and French war, no man in England was a ſtronger advocate for the Americans. In his ſpeeches in Parliament he ſupported all their pretenſions, he juſtified all their proceedings, and often pointed out the meaſures, in the Britiſh Houſe of Commons, for diſtreſſing Britain, which the Americans afterwards purſued; in ſhort, on all occaſions he appeared a determined republican, and at the ſame time uſed the moſt ſtrenuous efforts to urge the Iriſh Romaniſts to revolt, for the purpoſe of increaſing the embarraſſments of the Britiſh Government. (See the Annual Regiſter, and Hiſtory of the late War, chiefly written by Mr. Burke.) At the time it pleaſed the Almighty to viſit His Majeſty with a grievous malady, which ſuſpended his exerciſe of the kingly functions, when his recovery was doubtful, and the mind of every honeſt and loyal man in the nation ſinking under diſmal apprehenſions of impending evils, and his heart burſting with grief for the danger of his beloved Sovereign, Mr. Burke exultingly declared in the Houſe of Commons, *that God had hurled His Majeſty from his throne.* Impious triumph of republican malignity! At no very long interval after this tranſaction, the French Revolution blazed forth like a volcano, conſumed the Monarchy, Religion, Laws, and Conſtitution of that country; eſtabliſhed a Republic, and proclaimed war and hoſtility againſt all Kings. In the progreſs of their career, the French leaders reduced to practice the whole theory of all Mr. Burke's republican

leſſons, which he had read with ſo much ſucceſs to the Americans, from whom the French derived all their political inſtruction. Mr. Burke ſuddenly renounced all his former principles, and employed his polluted pen, yet ſtained with democratic ink, in reprobating, with the utmoſt energy, all the proceedings of the French Democrats, though their enormities were committed in conformity to the principles laid down in his former political lectures. It muſt be admitted that he ſung his palinodia with great ſucceſs and applauſe. He expoſed, with much juſtice, force, and perſpicuity, the treaſon, wickedneſs, and cruelty, of the French Anarchiſts; developed their arts and deceptions with great acuteneſs, and raiſed the abhorrence of the Britiſh nation, as well againſt them, as againſt a faction of atheiſtical republicans at home, who attempted to ſpread the contagion of the deſolating Gallic doctrines through the Britiſh dominions. But to what cauſe can this ſudden change in Mr. Burke's political conduct be attributed? I can gueſs at no other than his enthuſiaſtic zeal for the advancement of the political purſuits and intereſts of the Romiſh Church, of which he has ſhown himſelf, for a ſeries of years, the profeſſed advocate. The French atheiſtical uſurpers proſcribed Chriſtianity and all its profeſſors: they conſequently proſcribed Popery, the heretofore eſtabliſhed religion of France, with all its intereſts, and confiſcated the whole Church Revenues. This excited Mr. Burke's rage and reſentment againſt them; and hence his reprobation of their republicaniſm. In one of his publications he complains, in the bitterneſs of his heart, that they have pulled down the *Majeſty* of Religion; and Popery certainly does affect great external pomp and grandeur. However, if any perſon ſhall ſuggeſt a more

probable cauſe of the ſudden alteration in the political conduct of Mr. Burke, I ſhall readily relinquiſh my hypotheſis. This gentleman, very unfortunately for the repoſe of Ireland, and conſequently of Great Britain, has influenced ſome men of great rank and power in England to concur with him in the project of communicating with the Iriſh Romaniſts the ſupreme power of the State, by admitting them into Parliament; and has had the addreſs, at the ſame time, to perſuade them, by groſs miſtatement, that the Romaniſts are powerful enough in Ireland to compel an acquieſcence in ſuch their ambitious views, and that it is therefore good policy to give that which cannot be withheld. He has alſo, by the ſame means, perſuaded them, in defiance of truth, that the Iriſh Romaniſts are grievouſly oppreſſed by their Proteſtant fellow-ſubjects; that they are Monarchiſts; the Iriſh Proteſtants, Republicans. He has worked on their generoſity, by preaching up the doctrines of Liberality, Conciliation, Emancipation, and Reform; concealing under ſuch ſpecious names and titles, Romiſh Perſecution, Rancour, Subverſion and Proſcription of the Proteſtant Religion, Democracy, and Separation, the certain conſequences of the ſucceſs of his projects.

Evident marks of the progreſs of Mr. Burke's doctrines in favour of the Iriſh Romaniſts may be diſcovered in moſt of the Speeches of great and powerful Noblemen and Commoners in England on the ſubject of Union, copies of which have been publiſhed, and will be hereafter noticed. *This ſect of Britiſh Politicians may be diſtinguiſhed by the name of Burkiſts;* and from the power and influence of this ſect, fatally miſinformed and miſled with reſpect to the affairs and ſtate of Ireland, the

the procraſtination and delay of vigorous meaſures for prevention of the Rebellion are generally attributed; and to the ſame ſource may be traced many of the meaſures lately purſued, and, I am ſorry to ſay, ſtill purſuing, in Ireland, which give the higheſt diſguſt to the whole body of Iriſh Proteſtants, and which, inſtead of promoting an Incorporating Union of Great Britain and Ireland, are in fact throwing obſtacles in the way of it; all which, however, I have the ſtrongeſt hopes that the good ſenſe of the nation will ſurmount.

I have ſtated that the late Iriſh Rebellion was ſuppreſſed by the Proteſtants of Ireland. To prove that fact, it is only neceſſary to recur to dates. The Rebellion broke out on the 23d of May 1798. The whole Regular Army, the Militia, and the Yeomanry, then in the kingdom, were the proper forces of Ireland, and paid by Ireland. Moſt of the regular troops had, at different periods before, been ſent out of the kingdom on foreign ſervice, and their places ſupplied by Fencible Regiments, many of them Scotch; but as theſe troops were paid by the Iriſh Treaſury, and were ſent in lieu of the Iriſh trained troops employed on foreign expeditions, I do not account them Britiſh troops ſent to our aſſiſtance in preventing or ſuppreſſing the Rebellion. On the 23d of May 1798, the day the Rebellion broke out, the towns of Naas, Carlow, Baltinglaſs, Monaſtereven, and Clane, were attacked, and the Rebels beaten at them all, principally by the Iriſh Militia and Yeomen. On the 29th of the ſame month, General Sir James Duff defeated a large body of Rebels at Kildare, and opened the paſſage from Dublin to Munſter, which had been obſtructed by them. On the ſame day

the town of Enniſcorthy, in the county of Wexford, was attacked by a great body of Rebels, commanded by one Murphy, the Romiſh Prieſt of a neighbouring pariſh. It was defended by the Proteſtant Yeomanry alone. It was an open place, without fortification, and the Yeomen fought with them at the outſkirts of the town. The conteſt was long and bloody. The Yeomanry amounted to about three hundred only; the Rebels to more than twice as many thouſands. Forty-ſeven of the Yeomanry were killed, and above five hundred of the Rebels. When the Romiſh inhabitants of the town found their rebel friends recoiling, they ſet fire to the houſes, moſtly thatched, in the rear of the Yeomanry, and obliged them, from ſmoke and heat, to file off from the town, which the Rebels then entered; and this gallant body of men retreated unmoleſted to Wexford, about eleven miles. The Rebels had, on the preceding day, defeated a party of about one hundred of the North Cork Regiment of Militia, put them every man to death, except three who eſcaped, and got poſſeſſion of their muſkets and ammunition, with which they greatly galled the Enniſcorthy Yeomanry. On this ſucceſs, the Peaſantry of the country, being for the moſt part Romaniſts, joined the Rebels, and they marched on to Wexford, being a ſea-port, and the county town. There were but few troops in the place. Some Gentlemen in the neighbourhood raiſed Yeomanry Corps; but having imprudently enrolled Romaniſts among them, they to a man deſerted to the Rebels, with their arms and ammunition; and there were multitudes of Romiſh inhabitants in the town, who ſhowed evident ſigns of diſaffection. Theſe circumſtances induced the Commander of the troops to take the reſolution of abandoning

ing it, and marching to Duncannon Fort, a ſtrong place about thirty miles diſtant, whither he immediately marched, with all the Proteſtant Yeomanry of both the towns of Wexford and Enniſcorthy; and the Rebels took poſſeſſion of this ſea-port town on the 30th of May 1798.

On this ſucceſs of the Rebels, the whole Romaniſts of the counties of Wexford, Wicklow, Kildare, and Carlow, joined them. They defeated a detachment of the army, which had marched from Dublin to the relief of the Wexford Proteſtants, under Colonel Walpole, a brave man, but an unſkilful commander, who ſuffered himſelf to be ſurpriſed by this banditti. He paid the forfeit of his life to his raſhneſs: his party retired into the county of Wicklow, and took poſt at Arklow. The Rebels, elated with this ſucceſs, muſtered their forces, and marched to attack the town of Roſs, which, with Duncannon Fort and the town of Newtown-Barry, were the only places in the county of Wexford occupied by the Loyaliſts. The Regiment of Militia of the county of Dublin, commanded by Lord Mountjoy, with ſome other troops and Yeomanry Corps, had taken poſt in Roſs, all under the command of Generals Johnſon and Euſtace, both Iriſh officers. Their whole force amounted to about fifteen hundred. The town is not fortified: there are ſome remains of an old wall, which formerly ſurrounded it, but it is now in ruins. The Rebels commenced the aſſault with a body of twenty-five thouſand men. The troops received them outſide the town. The Rebels, to diſorder the troops, drove before them, with their pikes, a vaſt number of horſes and oxen. They had ſome field-pieces and howitzers, which they had taken

at the rout of a ſmall detachment of the garriſon of Duncannon Fort, ſent out againſt them very imprudently by the Governor; and alſo when they defeated the troops under Colonel Walpole: their leaders had alſo diſtributed among them a conſiderable quantity of whiſkey, to render them the more deſperate by intoxication. They attacked the troops with great fury; and Lord Mountjoy was killed, gallantly fighting at the head of his regiment. This Nobleman was the firſt perſon who introduced a bill into the Iriſh Parliament for the repeal of a part of the Popery Code, and unfortunately felt the bitter effects and inefficiency of his own ſyſtem of conciliation. The weight of the Rebel column, after a furious conteſt, forced the troops into the town, and the battle was continued fiercely in the ſtreets; till at length the courage and diſcipline of the Loyaliſts prevailed, and the Rebels were compelled, after a dreadful carnage, to retreat. Their ſlain in the ſtreets of the town and ſuburbs amounted to two thouſand two hundred, excluſive of numbers who crawled away from the battle, and died afterwards of their wounds. The Military were ſo fatigued, that they were not able to purſue them. The battle, from the commencement of the aſſault to the final retreat of the Rebels, laſted eight hours. This was the firſt great and deciſive advantage gained over the Rebels. The battle was fought on the 5th of June 1798, and was gained principally by the undaunted bravery of the Iriſh Militia and Yeomanry, conducted by two Iriſh officers.

The Rebel Army not being diſperſed at Roſs, their leaders determined to try their fortune again; and in a few days after their unſucceſsful attack on Roſs, they

marched to the other ſide of the county of Wexford, and aſſaulted the town of Arklow, lying on the great road from Wexford to Dublin, about thirty-three miles from that city. They commenced their aſſault on this town, which is alſo unfortified, with a body of eighteen thouſand men. The troops quartered there under General Needham did not exceed twelve hundred; notwithſtanding which the Rebels were repulſed with great ſlaughter, chiefly by the courage of the regiments of Cavan Militia, commanded by Colonel Barry, and Durham Fencibles, commanded by Colonel Skerret, together with a conſiderable body of Yeomanry.

On the 7th of June 1798, a body of Rebels ſuddenly aſſembled in the county of Antrim in the northern part of the kingdom, ruſhed furiouſly into the town of Antrim, where many of the gentlemen of the county, and ſeveral juſtices of the peace, were aſſembled, and among the reſt Lord O'Neil: a ſkirmiſh enſued between the Rebels and the Yeomen of the town, who, though ſurpriſed, immediately ran to their arms, and collected themſelves into a body. Lord O'Neil received a mortal wound. It was remarked, as in the caſe of Lord Mountjoy, that this Peer, a very amiable man, when he ſat in the Houſe of Commons, was one of the moſt zealous ſupporters of the repeal of the Popery Code, and ſuch were the fruits of his exertions in that cauſe! About the ſame time the Rebels roſe in a part of the county of Down, but were immediately attacked, defeated, and diſperſed, by General Nugent, who commanded the troops at Belfaſt. This inſurrection broke out on the eſtate of the Earl of Moira, moſt of whoſe tenants were actively engaged in it; which tends to ſhow how miſerably his Lordſhip was deceived; who not

not long before had viſited his eſtate in Down, and reſided in his manſion-houſe at Ballinahinch for ſome time; and on his return to England praiſed the exemplary loyalty of the inhabitants of the county of Down in the Houſe of Peers, and particularly of his own tenants; yet this very town was then a magazine of arms for the Rebels, and his tenants were deeply engaged in the conſpiracy for a Rebellion. Such were the diſſimulation and ſecrecy of theſe traitors, that they could impoſe on this loyal Peer, in his own manſion-houſe, on his own eſtate! Theſe were the only inſurrections in the north of Ireland; they were quelled in a few days.

The Rebels in the county of Wexford, where the chief force of the Leinſter inſurgents was concentred, after their defeats at Roſs and Arklow already mentioned, drew their main body together, conſiſting of about eighteen thouſand men, to Enniſcorthy; and encamped on a high and ſteep hill, called Vinegar Hill, adjacent to that town, which it overlooks and commands; the Slaney, a very conſiderable river, running at the baſe of the hill in a winding channel, and waſhing one half of its circumference. This was a very ſtrong poſt, and if well defended might have bid defiance to a conſiderable army. Defeated as the Rebels had been, they ſeemed to have given up the idea of offenſive operations, till their French ſuccours ſhould arrive, which they impatiently expected; and relying on the ſtrength of their poſition, determined to await there the attack of the Royal army, which they knew was aſſembling on all ſides: they had at the ſame time a numerous garriſon in the town of Wexford, a ſea-port; and were in poſſeſſion of the whole ſea-coaſt of that county from Arklow to the mouth of Waterford harbour;

all

all which their poſition effectually covered; and the run from thence to the coaſt of France, particularly to Breſt, was ſhort; they had ſome good cannon and howitzers, and were in no want of ammunition. The Royal army, a great part of which was Militia and Yeomen, attacked them on the 20th of June 1798, drove them from their poſition after a feeble reſiſtance; and the whole body would have been killed or taken priſoners, had not one column of the army, by ſome miſtake of orders, marched in a direction different from that in which it ought to have been conducted, and did not arrive at its appointed ſtation in proper time; ſo that a gap was left by which almoſt the whole rebel army eſcaped, but in the greateſt diſorder; part of them flying towards the mountains of Wicklow, and part to the chain of mountains ſeparating the counties of Carlow and Wexford.

The Rebels in the town of Wexford, hearing of the defeat, abandoned the town, and fled with that party which ſhaped its courſe to the Wicklow mountains. The rebel party which retreated towards the mountains of Carlow, got from thence into the Kilkenny mountains, and there aſſaulted the little town of Caſtlecomer; the garriſon of Kilkenny, which had marched from thence to oppoſe them, commanded by Sir Charles Aſgill, declining to attack this routed banditti, headed by a Romiſh prieſt, of the name of Murphy, a drunken ruffian: but a conſiderable body of Yeomanry from the adjacent Queen's County, with the gallant Colonel Pole at their head, advanced againſt them, compelled them to retreat, and purſued them with activity: their brave leader ſent advice of his ſucceſs to Sir Charles Aſgill, who again marched out of Kilkenny, joined the Yeomanry, and both fell on this

this party of fugitive Rebels, in number about five thouſand, routed them with a very great ſlaughter, and completely diſperſed them : Murphy, their leader, fled drunk from the field of battle, and was ſhortly after taken at Tullow in the county of Carlow, and hanged. All theſe tranſactions happened within a few days after the rout of the Rebels at Vinegar Hill on the 20th of June 1798 ; and from that time it may be juſtly ſaid, that the Rebellion was extinguiſhed : for though the party which fled to the mountains of Wicklow was compelled by hunger to deſcend into the plain country, and to make an inroad into the county of Meath, yet it was divided into ſmall detached bodies, which were hunted from place to place by the Yeomanry, and ſpeedily deſtroyed ; very few of them eſcaping back to the mountains. In fact, the battle of Vinegar Hill put an end to the laſt Iriſh Rebellion.

The dates of each memorable action in this ſhort, but bloody and waſteful Rebellion, are noted, to prove, that the ſuppreſſion of it was effected ſolely by the Troops, Militia, and Yeomen of Ireland, without any aſſiſtance whatſoever from England, and without the ſmalleſt interference of the Marquis Cornwallis, our preſent Lord Lieutenant : and a conciſe detail of the principal operations is given, to convince Britiſh Stateſmen, that Iriſh Romaniſts are not ſo formidable as to entitle them to ſuch conſideration as they at preſent ſeem to attach to them ; and that Iriſh Proteſtants are not ſo weak, that it has become neceſſary for the Britiſh Government to enter into a treaty with Iriſh Romaniſts, and to ſacrifice the Britiſh Conſtitution, as ſettled at the glorious Revolution, at the ſhrine of their ambition, for the preſervation of the Proteſtants of Ireland ; as ſeems to be an opinion entertained (or rather pretended

pretended to be entertained) by ſome Engliſh Stateſmen; if credit is to be given to the pamphlets publiſhed as the purport of ſeveral Speeches made in the Britiſh Parliament on the ſubject of the Union. This account of the ſuppreſſion of the Rebellion alſo proves, that the idea of keeping up the preſent eſtabliſhment in Ireland by force (if the Rebellions of Iriſh Romaniſts ſhall make force neceſſary) is not impracticable and abſurd, as is dogmatically and inſolently aſſerted by the Romiſh writer already ſo often mentioned. How ſhort would be the exiſtence, not only of the Proteſtant Eſtabliſhment in Ireland, but of the Iriſh Proteſtants themſelves, were they reduced to rely on the juſtice and mercy of their Romiſh fellow-ſubjects!

The Marquis Cornwallis landed in Ireland, and was ſworn into his office of Lord Lieutenant on the 20th of June 1798, ſubſequent to the ſignal defeats of the Rebels at Roſs and Arklow, on the very day of their deciſive diſcomfiture at Vinegar Hill, and after the total ſuppreſſion of the inſurrection in the North of Ireland. The firſt regiment of Engliſh Militia which arrived in Ireland, landed in Dublin on the 29th of June 1798; it was the Buckinghamſhire regiment: it was followed on the 1ſt of July 1798 by the Warwickſhire regiment: the arrivals of the other regiments of Engliſh Militia were all ſubſequent. They were not ſent to ſuppreſs the Rebellion, but to aſſiſt his Majeſty's faithful ſubjects in Ireland in repelling a French invaſion, which was then expected, and was ſhortly afterwards unſucceſsfully attempted by the enemy. Every loyal man in the kingdom welcomed theſe generous volunteers in the ſervice of their King and Country, with joy and gratulation; but this their reception was not owing to any idea entertained in Ireland, that ſhe lay under any particular

particular obligation to Great Britain for ſuch aſſiſtance; becauſe it is as much the intereſt of Great Britain to aſſiſt Ireland in repelling the common enemy, as it would be the intereſt of Ireland to aſſiſt Great Britain on a ſimilar emergency: they are both parts of one and the ſame empire, and their intereſts, in reſpect to defence againſt a common enemy, cannot be divided.

Obſervations on a pamphlet, entitled, 'Arguments for and againſt an Union conſidered.'

In this place it is proper to mention a pamphlet publiſhed in Ireland, entitled, '*Arguments for and againſt an Union conſidered*,' being the pamphlet which this Romiſh writer profeſſes to anſwer, and which he calls Mr. C.'s pamphlet. It is generally ſuppoſed to have been written by a Gentleman high in the confidence of Government, and contains many ſtrong arguments in favour of an Union; yet there are ſome parts of it which merit reprehenſion; and particularly thoſe in which the author grounds his arguments for an Union, on the power of the Iriſh Romaniſts: he uſes too frequently the argument of Intimidation to prevail on the Proteſtants of Ireland to reſort to the aſylum of an Incorporating Union with Great Britain, for protection againſt the irreſiſtible power of the Iriſh Romaniſts, as he repreſents it. The ſuppoſed author is an Engliſhman, and it has given me no ſmall degree of uneaſineſs to obſerve, that a Gentleman of abilities, as he certainly is, has ſo often deſerted the irrefragable arguments for the expediency, and even the neceſſity of an Incorporating Union of the two kingdoms, ariſing from conſiderations of the preſent ſtate of Europe, and evident mutual advantage of both countries; and reſorted to arguments of terror, grounded on unſubſtantial, fantaſtic, and fabulous repreſentations; as old women frighten froward children in a nurſery to compliance, by

ſtories

ſtories of fairies and hobgoblins. I am as ſincerely and zealouſly attached to the meaſure of an Incorporating Union, as any Miniſter or individual in the Britiſh Empire, can be: but I diſdain to ſupport ſo great, ſo important, ſo neceſſary a meaſure, by ſuch frivolous and puerile arguments: and when I find ſuch reſorted to by great Stateſmen, I am induced to ſuſpect, that ſome portentous innovation in the conſtitution of the Britiſh Empire is meditated, under the cloak of this ſalutary meaſure; and that Britons are to be reconciled to an acquieſcence in ſuch innovation, by fraudulently perſuading them, that the meaſure could not be effected, but through the medium of the innovation. *Aliquid monſtri alant!*

This Gentleman in his pamphlet ſtates, that Iriſh Romaniſts are to Iriſh Proteſtants in the proportion of three to one; this proportion is very raſhly adopted from the calculations of a ſeditious Romiſh aſſembly, which was collected ſome years ago in the city of Dublin, and which ſtyled itſelf the Catholic Convention; it prepared a Petition to His Majeſty on behalf of the Iriſh Romaniſts, which was a collection of impudent falſehoods, miſrepreſentations, and groundleſs calumnies againſt their Proteſtant fellow-ſubjects. This ſtatement I have already refuted. (See Appendix, No. 1.) He then ſtates, that the Iriſh Proteſtants have been obliged to rely upon Britiſh aſſiſtance for the preſervation of their property and exiſtence at different periods. This is very true; and the aſſiſtance has been furniſhed, becauſe the Iriſh Proteſtants were attacked by the Iriſh Romaniſts, for their attachment to the conſtitution in Church and State, as eſtabliſhed in England; and their fidelity to the Engliſh Crown; and becauſe it was abſolutely neceſſary for England to

ſupport

ſupport them, or abandon Ireland, part of her dominions; and ſhe might have as well abandoned Yorkſhire: ſhe aſſiſted the Iriſh Proteſtants for her own emolument; they were fighting her battles: but the inference attempted to be drawn from it in the pamphlet is, that the Iriſh Proteſtants are not *now* able to preſerve their property and exiſtence from deſtruction by the Iriſh Romaniſts, without the aſſiſtance of Great Britain: this I truſt is already ſatisfactorily proved not to be a fact. At the Revolution the Iriſh Romaniſts were completely conquered, their power reduced, and the Iriſh Proteſtant intereſt ſo firmly eſtabliſhed, and placed on ſuch ſolid foundations, that it has been ever ſince able to ſupport itſelf againſt the aſſaults of the Romaniſts, without the aſſiſtance of Great Britain; and is now fully able ſo to do: all that Iriſh Proteſtants require from their brethren in England is, that they will not be cheated into a ſupport of the Iriſh Romaniſts againſt them, and in fact againſt themſelves, by the miſrepreſentations and pernicious doctrines of the diſciples of Mr. Burke, the modern apoſtle of Popery: they deprecate the effects on the conſtitution of the ſpirit of Burkiſm in England. Certain it is, that the Iriſh Proteſtants would not be able to ſupport their properties and exiſtence againſt the Iriſh Romaniſts aſſiſted by a ſtrong French fleet and army, without the aſſiſtance of Great Britain; but in ſuch caſe they claim ſuch aſſiſtance, not as a boon, but as a right; not on their own account alone, but on that of Great Britain alſo: Ireland is a part of the Britiſh Empire: as ſuch ſhe is engaged in the preſent war with France; and the loſs of Ireland would be attended by a prodigious diminution of the ſtrength, probably by the deſtruction of that Empire: it could not receive a greater injury, a more deadly wound, by the French occupation

occupation of part of the iſland of Great Britain, than by the French occupation of Ireland: and when the Britiſh Government, or thoſe employed by them, argue on the preſumed weakneſs of the Proteſtants of Ireland, they are in fact depreciating their own ſtrength, inviting French invaſion, and exciting Iriſh Romaniſts to Rebellion!

The moſt dangerous and reprehenſible paragraph in the laſt-mentioned pamphlet is the following: 'Whilſt Ireland remains a ſeparate country from Great Britain, 'Great Britain is not pledged on any ſpecific principle to 'ſupport one *ſect* in Ireland more than another: if ſhe 'cannot preſerve the connexion of the two kingdoms in 'their eſtabliſhment, their power, and their property, 'I know not by what tie ſhe is debarred from aſſiſting 'the Catholics; for whilſt the kingdoms are ſeparate and 'independent, Ireland, *except where the Crown is concerned*, 'is merely bound by the ties of intereſt to England, and 'in a ſimilar manner England is only bound by the ties of 'intereſt, *and the rights of the Crown*, to Ireland: ſhe is 'pledged to preſerve Ireland to the Britiſh Crown, but 'not to any particular means, or any particular principles for maintaining that connexion.' Here then is a public declaration by a Gentleman, ſuppoſed to ſtand very high in the confidence of both the Iriſh and Engliſh Adminiſtrations, and who holds an employment of great truſt under Government, that it is totally immaterial to the Engliſh nation, whether Proteſtantiſm or Popery be the eſtabliſhed religion of Ireland. His Romiſh antagoniſt compares the Proteſtant religion to a Meduſa's head; he beſtows the title of *Sect* upon it. But it is worth while a little to examine the premiſſes, from which this extraordinary concluſion, that Great Britain is not

 bound

bound to ſupport the Proteſtant Religion, more than the Romiſh, in Ireland, is deduced: the one is, that the kingdom of Ireland, in its preſent ſtate, is ſeparate from, and independent of, the kingdom of Great Britain. This premiſs is falſe, for the kingdom of Ireland, in its preſent ſtate, is inſeparably annexed, united to, and dependant on the Imperial Crown of Great Britain: the ſupreme Executive Power in Great Britain and Ireland is veſted in the ſame perſon; but the ſupreme Executive Power in both kingdoms, is one of the three branches of the ſupreme Legiſlative Power in both; ſo that the two kingdoms have even part of their Legiſlative Powers common to both. No Act of Parliament can paſs in Ireland until after it has been ſent into England, and has there obtained the approbation of the Britiſh Cabinet, and has the great ſeal of England affixed to it; the Government of England, therefore, can, at its diſcretion, prevent the enaction of any law by the Legiſlature of Ireland: theſe are ſurely ſtrong bands of dependance of Ireland on Great Britain; and in fact, in the preſent ſituation of the two kingdoms, the connexion between them, and dependance of one on the other, are ſo ſtrong, that the Anti-Unioniſts, as is already obſerved, found on it their moſt powerful argument againſt an Incorporating Union, alledging that the two kingdoms are now inſeparably united, and that no further Union is neceſſary. His ſecond premiſs is, that, in their preſent ſtate, Great Britain cannot preſerve the connexion of the two kingdoms in their eſtabliſhment, their power, and their property: it is true this is introduced hypothetically, with an *if*, but the concluſion drawn from it is abſolute, at leaſt ſo far ſo, that without an Incorporating Union it is to be taken as abſolute. But this premiſs is as falſe as the other; for the Iriſh Proteſtants themſelves,

if

if Great Britain does not take a part againſt them, are able enough to preſerve their eſtabliſhment, their power and property, and their connexion with Great Britain, in defiance of the threats or rebellions of Iriſh Romaniſts; and no doubt can be entertained that Great Britain has power ſufficient to do the ſame: ſo that the concluſion, that Great Britain is not bound to ſupport the Iriſh Proteſtant more than the Iriſh Romaniſt, unlogically deduced from one falſe, and one hypothetic premiſs implying a falſity, falls to the ground. But the aſſertions, that Great Britain is not bound by any ſpecific principle to ſupport one more than the other; and that as ſhe is only bound to ſecure Ireland to the Britiſh Crown, without being bound to any ſpecific meaſures for ſo doing, ſhe may effect this, by giving her ſupport to the Romaniſts, and cruſhing the Proteſtants in Ireland; require ſome further animadverſion.

King James the Second was driven from his Throne by the Revolution of 1688, for attempting to place Romaniſts, both in Great Britain and Ireland, on an equal footing in reſpect to all civil privileges, with his Proteſtant ſubjects; and his Romiſh iſſue, if any he had, together with all the next heirs of the Crown, being Romaniſts, on the demiſe of his Proteſtant iſſue without iſſue, were declared by Act of Parliament incapable of ſucceeding to the Crown, and the ſucceſſion limited to his next Proteſtant relations, the iſſue of the Princeſs Sophia, grand-daughter of King James the Firſt, as if the intermediate Romiſh heirs were dead: and his preſent Majeſty, whom God long preſerve, under that title, now ſits on the Imperial Throne of the Britiſh Empire. Here then is a King dethroned, the hereditary ſucceſſion interrupted, and turned

into the Proteſtant channel, merely for the purpoſe of ſecuring a ſucceſſion of Proteſtant Monarchs to Great Britain and Ireland: a fundamental principle of our conſtitution is varied by a condition, to wit, that the next heir ſhall ſucceed to the Throne only on the terms of his being a Proteſtant. Does not His Majeſty hold his Crown by this Proteſtant title, and is he not bound to ſwear at his Coronation, that he will to the utmoſt of his power inviolably maintain the Proteſtant Religion as eſtabliſhed in Ireland, as well as in Great Britain? Are not His Majeſty and his ſucceſſors bound ſo to ſwear, as well by the Act of the 1ſt of William and Mary, as by the Articles of the Union of England and Scotland, and the Act confirming them? Why was the Crown limited to the Proteſtant heirs only, and why was ſuch variation made in our ancient law of Hereditary Succeſſion? Was it not to prevent, as far as human wiſdom could provide, all future attempts to give Popery an eſtabliſhment, either in Great Britain or Ireland? Is not Great Britain bound by a ſpecific principle to ſupport the Proteſtant Religion, in oppoſition to Popery, within herſelf? And is ſhe not bound by the ſame ſpecific principle to the ſame conduct in Ireland to the utmoſt of her power? How then can this Gentleman ſupport his poſition, that Great Britain is not bound by any ſpecific principle to ſupport the Proteſtant Religion, rather than Popery, in Ireland? It is an inſtance among many to be found in his pamphlet, how far men of good abilities may be led to advance the moſt unwarrantable poſitions, when they endeavour to deduce concluſions unſupported by the ſubſtantial pillars of Reaſon and Fact. Such is the nature of all his arguments of intimidation in favour of an Union.

I once

I once heard it roundly aſſerted, that if the Houſes of Lords and Commons ſhould agree on a bill for ſubverting the Proteſtant Eſtabliſhment in Ireland, His Majeſty, notwithſtanding his Coronation Oath, would be bound to give it the Royal aſſent, and thereby eſtabliſh it as a law, becauſe his Coronation Oath in all particulars is ſo to be conſtrued, that it is not binding againſt the opinion of the two Houſes. I never can agree with ſuch reaſoning—I cannot find any ſuch ſaving in the Coronation Oath: it is an abſolute Oath; and I never can allow that the two Houſes of Parliament have any ſuch power, as that of diſpenſing with the obligations of poſitive Oaths: I believe and hope, that the Parliament never will aſſume the power of abſolving from the obſervance of Oaths: it would thereby aſſume the power arrogated by the Pope, which is ſo much and ſo juſtly reprobated by all good Chriſtians. And as His Majeſty is bound by his Coronation Oath inviolably to maintain the Proteſtant Religion as it is now eſtabliſhed in Ireland, ſo is he bound to reſiſt all conceſſions of privileges to any claſs of his ſubjects, which would impair or weaken that eſtabliſhment; though perhaps they would not be at firſt attended, or immediately followed, by its total ſubverſion.

This Gentleman has alſo ſtated very erroneouſly, as a known hiſtorical fact, that the Iriſh Houſe of Commons was framed with the ſole view of excluding Roman Catholics. The fact is quite otherwiſe: the aſſertion is a ſlander on the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, invented by our modern Jacobin Reformers of Parliament; and is refuted by all hiſtory and records. (See Carte's Hiſtory of the Duke of Ormond, pages 11. 13. 18, 19.) I am ſur-

priſed that he could be hurried into ſuch ſtrange miſtakes: I have heretofore fully refuted this aſſertion, in my 'Anſwer to Mr. Grattan's Addreſs,' from undoubted authority of hiſtory and records; and any perſon who wiſhes to be informed on this head, may be ſatisfied by reading part of that anſwer, under the title of 'Remarks on Mr. Grattan's 'Account of the Creation of Boroughs.' Romaniſts were excluded from Parliament by teſts impoſed by Acts of Parliament: a demonſtration, if Hiſtory had been ſilent on the point, that the Houſe of Commons was framed antecedent to the excluſion of Romaniſts: and theſe teſts were impoſed from neceſſity; the Romaniſts by rebellions and maſſacres, which had their origin in their religious principles, having proved the impracticability of communicating the ſupreme authority of the State with them. Romaniſts are excluded from ſeats in the Parliament of Great Britain by the impoſition of the ſame teſt oaths. Will this Gentleman aſſert, that the Britiſh Houſe of Commons was framed with the ſole view of excluding Romaniſts? He has many other objectionable paſſages in his pamphlet, of which his antagoniſt, the writer of '*The Caſe of Ireland Re-conſidered*,' has not failed to take the advantage: I am very ſorry that the merit of many excellent arguments in favour of an Union contained in it ſhould be leſſened by ſuch crudities; particularly as I have a great reſpect and eſteem for the ſuppoſed author of it: and I would not have taken any notice of his pamphlet, except to commend it, had not his antagoniſt availed himſelf of the miſtakes and miſtatements in it, and thereby put me to the neceſſity, in expoſing his miſchievous poſitions, of animadverting in ſome degree on this performance.

Continuation of the Strictures on 'The Caſe of Ireland Re-conſidered.'

It is now time to refute the parts of the Romiſh author's pamphlet, in which he attempts, rather to inſinuate than prove, that the late Rebellion in Ireland was not a Romiſh Rebellion. He knew if he ventured to make ſuch an aſſertion directly, he laid himſelf open to direct refutation, and provoked it: he therefore choſe rather to make uſe of a mode of deſultory argument on this weak ſide of his defence of Iriſh Romaniſts, from the too well founded objections to their pretenſions, ariſing from their open acts of hoſtility againſt their Proteſtant countrymen, by aiming detached ſtrokes of accuſation againſt ſome reputed Proteſtants, who were concerned in the Rebellion. This mode of defence of his party is contrary to the general tenour of his argument; which is, that the Iriſh Romaniſts are excluded from equal privileges with their fellow-ſubjects, that their number and property entitle them to theſe privileges, that the excluſion therefrom warrants their hoſtility to the State, and that their propenſity to ſuch hoſtility will continue as long as the excluſion, and will break out into open acts of violence on every proper opportunity, and that the late Rebellion was the conſequence of ſuch excluſion; thereby in fact admitting, that it was a Romiſh Rebellion. In page 22 he has the following paragraph: 'No doubt a connexion with 'France has lately been renewed, but thoſe who took the 'lead in it were of all deſcriptions, but perſons chiefly 'Preſbyterians and Proteſtants; of five men who com-'poſed the (Iriſh) Directory, four were Proteſtants, al-'though of any other five men in the country, four were 'Catholics.' In page 11 he thus writes: 'May not the 'preſent misfortunes of Ireland be rather aſcribed to the 'efforts of a party (the Proteſtants) to force on us again 'our childiſh trammels which we had outgrown? This

'accounts for the union of all deſcriptions of men in 'the late *oppoſition to Government*.' It is worthy of notice, that he ſtyles Rebellion, *Oppoſition to Government*; ſo indeed it is with a vengeance! In page 47 is the following obſervation: 'It is difficult to compre-'hend the wiſdom of that ſyſtem, which drove Proteſtant, 'Preſbyterian, and Catholic, into a deſperate union againſt 'it.' There are many other ſtrokes of the ſame nature diſperſed through his pamphlet. To begin with the firſt aſſertion; that of the Iriſh Directory four were Proteſtants, and only one Romaniſt; the truth is, there was not of the five a Proteſtant: four of them were profeſſed Deiſts or Atheiſts, diſciples of Mr. Thomas Paine; and the fifth, M'Nevin, was a bigotted Romaniſt: he declared indeed, on his examination before the Committee of the Houſe of Lords, that he and his party meant to ſubvert the preſent Proteſtant Church Eſtabliſhment, and not to eſtabliſh any religion in its room, but he well knew that the ſubverſion of the Proteſtant Eſtabliſhment in Ireland would of itſelf be the eſtabliſhment of Popery. There was not one Proteſtant engaged in the Rebellion, except a few of the meaneſt of the Diſſenting claſs, in a corner of the North of Ireland, unleſs the avowed diſciples of Mr. Paine are to be accounted Proteſtants. Theſe Diſſenters were ſeduced into it, by plauſible pretences of Reform of Parliament and Abolition of Tithes: but the barbarous conduct of the Leinſter Rebels, in maſſacring all Proteſtants they could lay their hands on in cold blood, ſoon convinced them of their error; and one of their leaders, an attorney by profeſſion, being taken and hanged, at his execution declared that he and his party were then fully convinced, if they had ſucceeded, that they muſt have fought the battle over again; that

is,

is, that they would have to fight their Romiſh confederates, who they perceived intended to deſtroy all Proteſtants. A great proportion of the Inſurgents in the North were Romaniſts; for in both the counties of Down and Antrim, in which the Northern Inſurrection happened, there are many Romiſh inhabitants. This Inſurrection was very ſpeedily quelled. The leaders of the Diſſenters concerned in it were all notorious ſectaries, —Arians, Socinians, or Deiſts; there was not one real Chriſtian Diſſenter engaged in it, except a very few of the meaneſt of the people, who were cheated into it in the manner I have already mentioned. All Proteſtant Diſſenters of any account, who were real Chriſtians, joined heart and hand with the Proteſtants of the Eſtabliſhment throughout the nation, and fought courageouſly againſt the Inſurgents.

The great ſtrength of the Rebels lay in the province of Leinſter, and they were to a man Romaniſts, except about ſix, who were profeſſed Painites. Mr. Bagenal Harvey was one of theſe. A few days before the Rebellion broke out he had been arreſted on a charge of Treaſon, by order of Government, and was confined in the gaol of Wexford. When the Rebels got poſſeſſion of that town, ſoon after the commencement of the Inſurrection, they liberated Mr. Harvey; and as he was a man of ſome eſtate and intereſt in the county, they choſe him for a nominal leader only, and he marched with them to the attack of Roſs. His command was merely nominal: he never had any effectual authority among them. As ſoon as they were defeated at Roſs, they depoſed him, and choſe a Romiſh Farmer, one Roach, who had been the permanent Serjeant of a Yeomanry Corps,

Corps, and had deſerted, one of their Generals; together with a number of others, all Romaniſts, to wit, Sutton, Fitzgerald, Parry, Hay, Roach, and Murphy, the two laſt Romiſh Prieſts, and many other Prieſts. They firſt aſſembled in the county of Wexford, by pariſhes, at the reſpective Romiſh chapels, and were generally headed by their Prieſts. Mr. Harvey, when he ſaw them commence the maſſacre of the Proteſtants, which he was unable to prevent, ſpoke feelingly, to a friend he happened to fall in with, of his own ſituation: 'I ſee now 'my folly,' ſaid he, 'in embarking in this cauſe with 'theſe people: if they ſucceed, I ſhall be murdered by 'them; if they are defeated, I ſhall be hanged.'

The aggregate body of the Leinſter Rebels, all Romaniſts, aſſembled in the county of Wexford. Their defeats and diſperſion I have already ſtated. Their barbarity was not exceeded by their inhuman forefathers in the maſſacre of the Proteſtants in the year 1641. The dioceſe of Ferns, in which this Rebellion broke out, was remarkable for a very pious, regular, and reſident body of Proteſtant Clergy. The Biſhop was almoſt always reſident, and had not for many years abſented himſelf from the dioceſe for a fortnight in each year, previous to 1798, though his reſidence was within fifty miles of the city of Dublin. He attended to his epiſcopal duty, in every branch of it, with the greateſt zeal and activity. In this calamitous year of Rebellion, he had, contrary to his uſual cuſtom, reſided in Dublin about two months, immediately previous to its breaking out; and was at that time, very fortunately for himſelf and his family, abſent from Ferns; otherwiſe he would have certainly fallen a ſacrifice to the bigotted fury of the Rebels. They were

were therefore obliged to content themſelves with the plunder and dilapidation of his houſe, which had been but lately erected, and on which he and his predeceſſor had expended above ten thouſand pounds. They burned his library, and deſtroyed his furniture. On the firſt burſt of the Inſurrection, the Rebels murdered, in the moſt barbarous manner, all the Proteſtant Clergymen they could lay their hands on. The Reverend Meſſrs. Turner, Burrowes, Throke, Pentland, and Heydon, fell ſacrifices to their ſanguinary bigotry. They in ſome days after took the Reverend Mr. Owen priſoner: they tortured him, and he was thereby for ſome time bereft of his reaſon. His life was ſpared by ſome accident, as was that of the Reverend Mr. Francis, who, notwithſtanding, was ſo much reduced by famine (the Rebels having for many days allowed him no ſubſiſtence but ſome potatoes which had been cut into pieces for the purpoſe of planting), that he died ſhortly after he was delivered from them. They cauſed their Prieſts to baptize two or three other Proteſtant Clergymen who had fallen into their hands, and their lives were ſpared on their ſubmitting to have ſuch a ceremony performed upon them; the Rebels eſteeming ſuch ſubmiſſion an abjuration of their religion, and an adoption into the Romiſh Church. The Reverend Mr. Heydon, already mentioned, was a native of the county of Wexford, had ſpent almoſt his whole life there, was near eighty years of age, and was as charitable a man, and as much eſteemed, as any in the county. The Rebels inſiſted that he ſhould ſubmit to be baptized, which he declining to do, they immediately pierced him with their pikes, and he fell dead in the preſence of his wife: they ſtripped his body, and it lay expoſed in the ſtreets of Enniſcorthy for nine days,

days, till it was almoſt devoured by the ſwine. Some of the Rebels, leſs ferocious than the others, buried the body privately at night in the church-yard: the next day others of them dug it up, and flung it into the ſtreet. Such was the fate of this ancient Clergyman, as reſpectable in his profeſſion as any either in Great Britain or Ireland, who ſeemed to be beloved, and deſerved to be ſo, by all his pariſhioners, whether Proteſtants or Romaniſts. Moſt of the other Proteſtant Clergymen in the dioceſe were lucky enough to eſcape from theſe barbarians, ſome of them in open boats, acroſs the channel into Wales, carrying nothing with them but the clothes on their backs: they all loſt their properties, which were ſeized on as plunder by the Rebels.

Previous to the battle of Roſs, the Rebels had collected all the Proteſtants, men, women, and children, they could lay their hands on, in their march from Wexford to the battle. Theſe they left priſoners in the cuſtody of one of their captains, a farmer, of the name of Murphy, at the houſe of Mr. King, a Proteſtant Gentleman (who luckily eſcaped from their fury), at a place called Scollobogue, ſome miles diſtant from Roſs. About ſixty men were confined in the manſion-houſe, and the reſt, men, women, and children, to the number of one hundred and eighty-five, in the adjacent barn. On the day of the battle of Roſs, the Rebels diſpatched a meſſenger to Murphy, to deſire him, in the name of their General, to put all the priſoners to death, as the King's troops were getting the better, and the priſoners would eſcape. Murphy at firſt heſitated, and deſired a written order to warrant this barbarous execution; but a ſecond meſſage, to the ſame effect, was ſhortly after delivered to him

from Murphy, a Romiſh Prieſt, and one of the Rebel Commanders, with which latter order the Captain and his gang, conſiſting of about three hundred, determined to comply. The ſixty men were firſt brought out of the manſion-houſe, man by man, and all ſhot, or murdered by the ſtabs of pikes, in the front of the houſe, except two, whom Murphy, for ſome reaſon or other, ſpared. The Rebels determined to make ſhorter work with the people in the barn, the majority of whom were women and children: they ſurrounded it, piled combuſtibles about it, and ſet it on fire. The encloſed victims endeavoured to force the doors: their barbarous executioners kept up an inceſſant fire of muſketry upon them, and killed all who ſhowed their heads. The doors were divided in the middle, ſo that the upper parts were open whilſt the lower parts were cloſed. The Rebels threw numberleſs ſheaves of ſtraw, all in flames, into the barn at theſe apertures. One unhappy woman had a child in her arms, which ſhe was ſuckling: finding death inevitable, ſhe put the child out over the lower part of one of the doors, in hopes that ſome of theſe barbarians might have ſome ſparks of humanity yet twinkling in their boſoms, and would ſave the life of the infant. She was diſappointed: the child was immediately transfixed with a ſpear, and lifted up on the end of it, writhing with torture. This action was loudly applauded by the ſurrounding Rebels! Their ſhouts of triumphant exultation rent the air! The whole number encloſed in the barn were either ſhot dead at the doors, attempting to force their way out, or conſumed within it.

In the town of Wexford, the Rebels had ſeized a number of Proteſtants, whom they confined in the gaol.

Out

Out of theſe they daily, during the continuance of the Rebellion, ſelected a few, and murdered them with great parade in the moſt public part of the town; generally marching them under ſtrong guards through the ſtreets to the end of the bridge, military muſic attending, and playing a dead march; charging them with no crime whatſoever, except that they were heretics irreclaimable. At the end of the bridge they were put on their knees, immediately pierced with pikes, and their bodies thrown into the river, which is there deep and broad. But on the day of the deciſive battle of Vinegar Hill, diſtant only eleven miles from Wexford, the Rebels in the town determined to murder all their priſoners; and on that day they conducted eighty-ſix Proteſtants from the gaol to the bridge, marching them by ſixteen or eighteen at a time, with muſic playing a dead march, and there murdered them all with their pikes. The Rebel who ſhowed himſelf moſt active in this butchery was celebrated by the reſt as *a Hero, who never winced at running a Heretic through the body.* Such were their expreſſions! The remaining priſoners, men, women, and children, were doomed to ſlaughter on the next day; but a party of the King's troops in the morning ruſhed ſuddenly into the town: the Rebels, fought their ſafety in flight, and the lives of upwards of three hundred Proteſtants were ſaved. All the facts I have above mentioned of the barbarities committed by the Rebels, are notorious, and have been proved on the oaths of the moſt reſpectable witneſſes, on the trials of ſeveral Rebels, who have been convicted of having been concerned in theſe maſſacres. It is in vain for Romiſh writers to deny them: they dare not attempt it in Ireland, where all people are perfectly acquainted with the above circumſtances. This Romiſh

writer has publiſhed his inſidious pamphlet in England; it is calculated for that meridian; he hoped to impoſe on the credulity of ſtrangers; and even there he had not aſſurance peremptorily to aſſert that it was not a Romiſh Rebellion,—he only ſtrongly inſinuates that it was not.

The Inſurgents in the two counties of Antrim and Down were partly Proteſtant Diſſenters of the loweſt claſs, and partly Romaniſts. They were few in number, feeble in their operations, and were ſpeedily diſperſed. They committed no maſſacres, becauſe the Romaniſts among them were obliged to conceal their ſanguinary projects from the Proteſtant Diſſenters aſſociated with them, and whom they had drawn into the Rebellion by holding forth to them the ſcheme of a Democratic Republic, and the ſubverſion of the Church Eſtabliſhment. Theſe Inſurgents in the North, of different religious perſuaſions, had different views, which they ſtudiouſly concealed from each other. The Diſſenters among them thought they were making tools of the Romaniſts, to aſſiſt in the overthrow of the Eſtabliſhment in Church and State, and the ſubſtitution of a Republic; believing that they would be able to ſecure the political power in ſuch a State to themſelves, and introduce that ſpecies of religious perſuaſion which, in the days of Cromwell, was diſtinguiſhed by the name of *Independency*, throughout the nation: their principal leaders were diſguiſed Atheiſts. The Romaniſts, on the other hand, thought, and with much more reaſon, that they were making tools of the Diſſenters, by inducing them to aſſiſt in the ſubverſion of the Proteſtant Eſtabliſhment in Church and State, and the ſubſtitution of a Democratic Republic; becauſe they knew that ſuch a project could not be carried into

execution

execution but by the extirpation of all the Iriſh Proteſtants of the Eſtabliſhment, and a Separation from Great Britain, for ages the favourite purſuits of Iriſh Romaniſts; and they ſaw plainly enough that the whole political power of the nation muſt fall into their hands, in the event of the ſucceſs of ſuch projects; becauſe the Proteſtant Diſſenters in Ireland do not amount to one eighth part of the Romaniſts in number; and in a Democratic Republic, ſuch a ſmall ſection of the people, bereft of the ſupport of the Proteſtants of the Eſtabliſhment, and of Great Britain, could have very little political influence, if they were even ſuffered to remain in the country, which, from the religious tenets of the Romaniſts, is highly improbable. The Romaniſts know alſo, that the ſubverſion of the Proteſtant Eſtabliſhment would of itſelf be a ſubſtitution of a Romiſh, without further trouble; for, from the religious tenets of the Romiſh Faith, its votaries are bound to pay their tithes to their reſpective Pariſh Prieſts, without the ſanction of any temporal law whatſoever; and hence it is, that all laws enforcing the payment of tithes to Proteſtant Clergymen by them are accounted impious, and the exaction of ſuch payment a ſacrilege; *which tenet of itſelf will for ever render them irreconcilable enemies to a Proteſtant Eſtabliſhment.* Hence their Clergy, by the ſucceſs of their deſigns, would be immediately put into poſſeſſion of all the tithes of the nation. Add to this the immenſe ſums which the Romiſh Clergy levy on their Laity from Confeſſions, from Indulgences, from the doctrine of Purgatory, from Diſpenſations, and other concomitants of their ſuperſtition, reprobated by the Proteſtant doctrines; and it will be eaſily ſeen, that it would not be neceſſary, on the ſubverſion of the Proteſtant Church Eſtabliſhment,

to

to ſecure, by temporal laws, any particular endowment for the ſupport of the Romiſh Clergy; and that, even in their preſent condition, they levy a very ample ſubſiſtence on their people.

The horrible cruelties exerciſed by the great body of the Rebels in Leinſter on the Proteſtants, ſoon alarmed the few Diſſenters, confederates of the Romiſh Inſurgents in the North. They immediately ſaw into the real deſign of their new allies; and withdrawing themſelves from a conſpiracy which, they clearly perceived, would in its ſucceſs be attended with their own deſtruction, all projects of Rebellion vaniſhed in the province of Ulſter. Rebellion there was but partially entertained; it never had very numerous partiſans: the flame, thus feeble, was eaſily quenched, never to be re-kindled; and the people have returned to their accuſtomed induſtrious purſuits. The great ſtrength of the Rebellion lay in the province of Leinſter. The whole maſs of the Romiſh inhabitants of the counties of Wicklow, Wexford, Kildare, and Carlow, roſe at once. Many inhabitants of the adjacent counties, particularly of Meath and Dublin, of the ſame religious perſuaſion, joined them. Their number in arms at one time amounted to upwards of fifty thouſand men. Confiding in this ſtrength, they did not think it neceſſary to conceal their deſigns of extirpating the Proteſtants: the exciſion of all Heretics they, on the contrary, proclaimed to be their object and intention; and evinced, by their actions, the ſincerity of this declaration.

So early as the year 1792, the Iriſh Romaniſts had projected this Rebellion, and commenced their operations preparative of it. In that year, a Secret Committee of

them, which had before for ſome years privately aſſembled in Dublin, determined to take deciſive ſteps towards combining their whole collected power throughout the nation, and making one united effort to ſeparate the nation from Great Britain, ſubvert the Monarchy, and eſtabliſh a Romiſh Democratic Republic in Ireland, under the protection of France, which encouraged them to the attempt, and whoſe anarchical ſchemes they reſolved to adopt. The ſucceſs of the French Revolutioniſts inſpired them with hopes of ſimilar ſucceſs; and ſome popular characters in England and Ireland appeared publicly as their abettors, particularly Mr. *Edmund Burke*, who diſpatched his ſon to Ireland to act as their agent, in which capacity he exerted himſelf with great zeal and activity. They were thus emboldened to adopt very daring and open meaſures for carrying their project into execution. With this view a Romiſh merchant in Dublin, one of this private Society, iſſued a kind of writs for the election of a general Repreſentative Aſſembly of the Iriſh Romaniſts, to meet at a certain day in the city of Dublin, there to deliberate on the intereſts of that body, and to concert proper methods for what was ſtyled the Emancipation of the Romaniſts. Theſe writs were directed to the Romiſh Pariſh Prieſts throughout the kingdom, who were to ſuperintend the execution of them. They were executed in the following manner: The Romiſh inhabitants of each pariſh were ſummoned by the Prieſt to meet at the Romiſh chapel; and there two deputies were elected by the majority of the votes of the adults of the whole congregation without diſtinction. Theſe deputies met the deputies of all the pariſhes of a barony or hundred, at an appointed time and place, and elected, by plurality of votes, two deputies for the barony from among

among themſelves. Theſe two baronial deputies met, at a certain time and place, the other baronial deputies, and elected two deputies from among themſelves, as repreſentatives of the county. The ſame mode of election of repreſentatives was purſued in cities and towns corporate. Theſe repreſentatives met at the Taylors' Hall, in the city of Dublin, appointed proper officers, and continued ſitting for many weeks, with the doors of the hall carefully cloſed and guarded, within a furlong of the Caſtle of Dublin, the reſidence of the Viceroy. Their aſſembling was open and notorious: their deliberations were kept profoundly ſecret. The Magiſtracy of the city of Dublin would have immediately diſperſed this unlawful aſſembly, which, in imitation of the French, aſſumed the title of *the Catholic Convention;* but the Government declined to warrant or countenance ſuch exertion of the Police. This Convention compoſed a paper, which they ſtyled the Petition of the Roman Catholics of Ireland to His Majeſty, which is one entire ſyſtem of the moſt audacious and groundleſs falſehoods and miſrepreſentations that was ever framed: it is a virulent and malicious invective and libel on the Proteſtants of Ireland and the eſtabliſhed Government, and a forgery of grievances of Iriſh Romaniſts which never exiſted. They at length cloſed their ſeſſion, firſt electing nine of their members to compoſe a permanent Council of Iriſh Traitors. This they ſtyled the Permanent Committee of the Roman Catholics of Ireland. Of theſe M'Nevin, their Ambaſſador to the French Directory, was the chief. They levied great ſums of money by a regular aſſeſſment, which they impoſed on the Iriſh Romaniſts, and to which they univerſally ſubmitted. They ſent a deputation to Belfaſt, to ſeduce the

Proteſtant Diſſenters there to enter into a confederacy with them, for the annihilation of the Conſtitution, under pretence of a co-operation for a Reform of the Repreſentation in Parliament; and to the operations of that Deputation is the late feeble Northern Inſurrection, which I have mentioned, to be aſcribed. They appointed deputies to preſent the flagitious libel, which they ſtyled a Petition to His Majeſty; and ſo great was the influence of Mr. Burke in England at that time, that he procured the introduction of theſe Deputies to His Majeſty, by one of the Secretaries of State; and they preſented their Petition. To the ſame influence is juſtly to be attributed the paſſive conduct of the Iriſh Government, in reſpect to that unlawful aſſembly. The whole maſs of the Iriſh Romaniſts ſubmitted to the authority of this Committee of Nine. They were ſelected out of the Repreſentatives choſen by them all in the manner I have mentioned, and appointed by the votes of that whole body to conduct the projects and ſchemes of the Iriſh Romaniſts; they are therefore to be conſidered as their exiſting Repreſentatives, and they have acted as ſuch ever ſince, till the breaking out of the Rebellion. One of them, M'Nevin, was the moſt active diplomatic member of the Iriſh Directory.

In the year 1795, when Earl Fitzwilliam was appointed Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, the Committee of Nine determined that the whole maſs of Iriſh Romaniſts ſhould preſent a Petition to Parliament, praying, or rather demanding, what they ſtyled Emancipation; that is, the ſubverſion of the Proteſtant Eſtabliſhment in Church and State. They publiſhed a precedent of ſuch a Petition in the public Newſpapers, and ſent out their mandate

mandate to all of their perſuaſion in every part of Ireland, commanding them to ſend up Petitions, drawn after that model, to be preſented to Parliament, ſigned by them in every diſtrict. This mandate was immediately complied with by the whole body. The aſſeſſments of the Convention have been always regularly paid to the Treaſurer, one of the Nine; and the Romiſh body throughout Ireland regularly correſponded with their Secretary M'Cormick, till he fled out of the kingdom, to eſcape puniſhment for his treaſon, ſome time after the commencement of the Rebellion. The Committee of Nine called a general meeting of the Iriſh Romaniſts on the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam. They met at a Romiſh chapel in Dublin. Several ſeditious ſpeeches were ſpoken at this aſſembly by M'Nevin, Keough, and Ryan, three members of the Committee of Nine; and by Lewins, their preſent Ambaſſador at Paris; and very ſeditious reſolutions were entered into by them, and the whole aſſembly. All theſe Speeches and Reſolutions the Committee publiſhed in ſeveral Newſpapers both in Great Britain and Ireland. In one of the Reſolutions agreed to by the whole body, they voted their moſt grateful thanks for his ſervices, and fifteen hundred pounds for his trouble, to Theobald Wolfe Tone, as one of their agents. He was at this time a traitor, in correſpondence with the French Convention, and employed by them to raiſe a Rebellion in Ireland. He was ſince taken by Sir John Borlaſe Warren's ſquadron, coming to invade Ireland with a French army, and having a French commiſſion in his pocket. He was convicted of high treaſon, and ordered for execution; but on the morning of the day appointed for his execution he cut his own throat. His brother, Matthew Tone, was

hanged and quartered for the ſame crime. *In another Reſolution, the Committee of Nine and their Aſſembly pledged themſelves, collectively and individually, to reſiſt even their Emancipation, if propoſed to be conceded on the ignominious terms of an acquieſcence in the fatal meaſure of an Union with Great Britain.*

Of this Committee of Nine, M'Nevin and Sweetman are now confined, as profeſſed traitors, at Fort George in Scotland; Ryan is dead; Keough and M'Cormick have found it prudent to withdraw out of the kingdom; another was long confined on ſuſpicion of treaſon, but has been lately liberated by the clemency of the Marquis Cornwallis. It is however generally believed that their places have been duly filled up, and that a Committee of Nine, as the Repreſentative of the whole maſs of Iriſh Romaniſts, ſtill ſubſiſts, maintains its authority over that body, and continues its operations.

From the detail of the Riſe and Progreſs of the late Rebellion, here faithfully given, it muſt be clear to every diſpaſſionate perſon, that it was a Romiſh Rebellion, and that it was hatched by the Romiſh Convention. But it may not be amiſs here to inſert ſome quotations from the Reports of the Secret Committees of the Britiſh and Iriſh Houſes of Lords reſpecting it. In the 'Report of 'the Committee of the Iriſh Houſe of Lords' (page 2) is the following paragraph: 'During that period' (1792 and 1793) 'very conſiderable ſums of money were 'levied upon the Roman Catholics of this kingdom, 'under the authority of a *Committee* of perſons of that 'perſuaſion, who then aſſumed, and ſeemed in a great 'degree to ſucceed in the government and direction of 'the

' the whole body of Iriſh Catholics.' Ibidem, page 4. ' We have taken up the detail of it from that period' (1795 and 1796), ' when the conſpiracy was *ſo matured* ' as to have for its avowed object the array and levy of ' a regular military force in every part of the kingdom, ' for the purpoſe of aſſiſting the French, if they ſhould ' be enabled to make a deſcent upon this country; or, if ' foreign aſſiſtance could not be procured, of making a ' general inſurrection, in the hope of ſubverting the ' Monarchy and Eccleſiaſtical Eſtabliſhment, of ſeizing ' the perſons and confiſcating the property of His Ma- ' jeſty's loyal ſubjects, and of eſtabliſhing a Republi- ' can Government guaranteed by the power of France.' And ibidem, pages 10, 11, 12, may be ſeen an account of the negotiations of M'Nevin, one of the Committee of Nine, with the French Directory, to which I refer the reader.

In the ' Report of the Secret Committee of the Houſe ' of Commons of Great Britain,' ſect. 2, page 10, is the following paſſage: ' The conſpirators in Ireland, unqueſ- ' tionably, always meditated the complete ſeparation of ' that country from Great Britain.' The Report then adverts to *the Society of United Iriſhmen*, which it ſtates to have been inſtituted in the year 1791. And here it is proper to ſtate, that the Romiſh Convention already mentioned was aſſembled in the year 1792, and that almoſt the whole of its members, if not the whole, were *United Iriſhmen*: that all the principal Romiſh leaders in the late Rebellion were members of this Convention; and all of them, together with the whole maſs of the Inſurgents, *United Iriſhmen*. In the Report laſt mentioned, ſect. 7, page 31, adverting to the mutiny in the

Britiſh fleet, is the following paſſage: 'It appears that 'oaths have been tendered by the Mutineers to the crew 'to be United Iriſhmen, equal to their brethren in Ire-'land, and have nothing to do with the King or his 'Government: that they have acted in the profeſſed 'expectation of aſſiſtance from France, with the expreſs 'view of co-operating for the expulſion of the Proteſt-'ants from Ireland, and the erection of a Roman Ca-'tholic Government. On another occaſion the Oath has 'been as follows: "I ſwear to be true to the free and 'united Iriſh, who are now fighting our cauſe againſt 'Tyrants and Oppreſſors, and to defend their rights to 'the laſt drop of my blood, and to keep all ſecret: and 'I do agree to carry the ſhip into Breſt, the next time 'the ſhip looks out a-head at ſea, and to kill every offi-'cer and man that ſhall hinder us, except the Maſter; 'and to hoiſt a green enſign with a harp in it, *and after-'wards to kill and deſtroy the Proteſtants.*" Ibid. page 32. 'Your Committee have no heſitation in ſtating on the 'cleareſt proof, ſtrongly confirmed by recent circum-'ſtances, that among the various bodies inliſted in any part 'of Great Britain for the purpoſes of ſedition and trea-'ſon, the ſocieties which have been formed by the 'United Iriſhmen in this country are in all reſpects the 'moſt formidable, particularly at the preſent moment; 'whether conſidered with a view to their combination, 'their actual numbers, or the atrocious nature of the 'deſigns, of which they are preparing, in a very ſhort 'time, to attempt the execution, in direct co-operation 'with France. The danger to be apprehended from 'theſe Societies is much increaſed, from the conſtant 'communication which they maintain with the Societies 'in Ireland, their mutual confidence in each other, and

' the alarming circumſtance of their being *at this mo-*
' *ment* ſubject to the ſame ſecret direction, and the ſame
' chiefs.'

This ' Report of the Britiſh Houſe of Commons' was ordered to be printed ſo late as the 15th of March 1799. And it is here worthy to be noted, that Mr. Tone, already mentioned, who is acknowledged to have been Agent of the Romiſh Convention in the year 1792, by their Permanent Committee, was the founder of the Society of United Iriſhmen in the year 1791; and it is pretty evident that the Romiſh Convention was only an aſſembly of the moſt conſiderable amongſt the perſonages which compoſed the Society of United Iriſhmen;—a ſpecies of florilegium of that holy brotherhood!

It is now time to inquire what it is which induces Iriſh Romaniſts to act ſo ferociouſly, and to thirſt ſo inſatiably for the blood of their Proteſtant fellow-ſubjects; a thirſt at this moment as unquenchable as in the year 1641, the era of the horrible Iriſh maſſacre! It cannot ariſe from the hatred of the native Iriſh to the Britiſh Colony, contracted from the tyranny of the Colony exerciſed over the natives, as is with equal effrontery and falſehood aſſerted by the author of the pamphlet entitled, ' *Conſiderations on the State of public Affairs in the Year* ' 1799. *Ireland*;' for at preſent, and for many years back, the native Iriſh, and the Britiſh, who from time to time migrated into Ireland and ſettled there, are ſo intermixed that no ſuch diſtinction as Native and Coloniſt can properly be ſaid now to remain in the kingdom; ſave that in ſome mountainous parts of the province of Connaught, and in the mountains in the ſouth of the counties

counties of Cork and Kerry, ſuch fuſion has not taken place in any conſiderable degree; and in thoſe parts there was no Rebellion. In the counties in which the Rebellion raged, to wit, thoſe of Wexford, Wicklow, Carlow, Kildare, Meath, and Dublin, the majority of the peaſantry, if their original race is to be diſcovered by their names, is Britiſh. There are two baronies in the county of Wexford, *viz.* thoſe of Forth and Bargy, entirely peopled by the deſcendants of old Engliſh ſettlers, who yet retain the old Engliſh language, as it was ſpoken in England in the time of Chaucer, and which is almoſt unintelligible to a modern Engliſhman. They are for the moſt part Romaniſts at this day, and were very active Rebels. The Engliſh who ſettled in other parts of Ireland, previous to the reign of Queen Elizabeth, are ſo completely incorporated with the original natives, that they cannot now be diſtinguiſhed from them by their language, cuſtoms, or manners; the ſurnames of the reſpective families of them alone mark their origin. They may be reputed natives; and there are few who retain Iriſh ſurnames through the nation, who have not Britiſh blood in their veins. The Romiſh inhabitants of Ireland called by Britiſh ſurnames, and generally reputed of Britiſh extraction, are the moſt powerful portion of Iriſh Romaniſts in point of property. In the late Rebellion, almoſt all the leaders of the Rebels had Engliſh ſurnames, and the maſs of the Inſurgents was of the ſame deſcription; the Rebellion having raged in the parts of Ireland directly oppoſite to Britain, and chiefly in that part formerly called the Pale, the principal ſeat of the ancient Engliſh Colony. Of the Proteſtant inhabitants of Ireland, a large portion has Iriſh ſurnames, and may be therefore reputed of native

Iriſh

Iriſh extraction. In a word, the only real and ſpecific diſtinction of the inhabitants of Ireland in the preſent time is, that of Proteſtants and Romaniſts. The ſanguinary hoſtility of the Iriſh Romaniſts againſt the Iriſh Proteſtants cannot therefore be attributed to a national antipathy ſubſiſting between Natives and Coloniſts; and there is as little ground for aſcribing it to any peculiar propenſity of the people of Ireland to cruelty, greater than that of other nations. Oppreſſion they cannot reaſonably complain of; for the Iriſh Romaniſts enjoy a greater portion of civil liberty, than the moſt favoured ſubjects of any foreign nation on the face of the earth. There is therefore no other reaſonable mode of accounting for it, but by an examination of the doctrines of their Religion: and whoever will attentively conſider the precepts of the Council of Lateran before quoted, reſpecting Hereſy, which they hold as a part of their creed, will there find the true ſources of all thoſe barbarities, and maſſacres of their fellow-ſubjects, which they have been guilty of. The legal puniſhment of Hereſy in the Britiſh dominions, during the domination of Popery, was burning alive: hence the burning alive of the unfortunate Proteſtants in the barn at Scollobogue, and the perſecution of them with fire and ſword in the late Rebellion. The Iriſh Romaniſts committed nothing which they were not warranted, nay commanded, to commit, by the Council of Lateran; and it is remarkable, that at the times of their perpetrating the moſt atrocious cruelties, they always branded their victims with the opprobrious title of Heretics.

The Romaniſts in Ireland, whether aboriginal, or of old Engliſh extraction, have always endeavoured to ſhake

ſhake off what they call the Engliſh yoke, that is, to ſeparate themſelves from England; and this political principle has contributed more than any other circumſtance to keep them ſteady to the Romiſh perſuaſion, as being hoſtile to the Proteſtant faith, the Religion of Britain: their leaders juſtly enough conſidering that hoſtility of Religions is a powerful cement of adverſe political parties, and a ſtrong barrier againſt all treaty; and that Separation from Britain will be always the favourite purſuit of men who firmly believe that Britons are an accurſed race, reprobated by Heaven, the objects of Divine vengeance, to be inflicted on them on earth by the ſwords of the faithful; they therefore ſupport and propagate the Romiſh Faith, as they have always done, with all their power and influence. And to this political principle of Separation from Britain, as a firſt cauſe, may be traced the perſevering attachment of ſuch a number of the inhabitants of Ireland to the Romiſh Faith: and of that attachment their cruelty to their Proteſtant countrymen is the immediate effect.

I ſhall now take ſome notice of the ſtrictures thrown out, by the Author of '*The Caſe of Ireland Re-conſidered*,' on the Popery Code ſome time ſince repealed in Ireland. The Author has ſummed up all the old common-place objections to that Code, advanced by the whole ſwarm of Romiſh ſcribblers, with all their exaggerations, ſince the enaction of it. His objections I have already mentioned; they are principally contained in pages 4 and 34 of his pamphlet. Notwithſtanding this Code has been for ſome years repealed, particularly all ſuch parts of it as he complains of, he again blazons forth its ſeverity, for the purpoſe of giving a new edge to the

weapons

weapons of his Romiſh countrymen (which he apprehends may have been ſomewhat blunted in the recent Rebellion and Maſſacre), and of miſleading the Engliſh nation into an unfounded opinion, that the Iriſh Romaniſts have been cruelly oppreſſed; and that their recent Rebellion has been the effect of that oppreſſion, not reſorted to for remedy (the Code having been repealed before the Rebellion), but for revenge. It is neceſſary to make a few remarks on his ſtrictures, to ſhow how abſurd they are, and what little ground there is for them: ſo very little indeed, that there is ſufficient reaſon to believe the writer to have been wholly unacquainted with the laws themſelves, and that he merely copied the obſervations he makes upon them from others. His ignorance of the laws of his country is manifeſt from more than one paſſage in his pamphlet. I ſhall give one remarkable inſtance here of his want of knowledge of the laws. In page 41, obſerving on what he calls the Teſt Oaths, meaning the Oaths adminiſtered to every Member of Parliament when he takes his ſeat in the Houſe, he has the following paſſage: 'Among theſe 'Oaths I ſuppoſe is included that of Abjuration, which 'is as violent an inſult to the religion of our allies, 'the firſt nations on the Continent of Europe, as the 'abominable Oath of Hatred to Royalty ſet up as a 'teſt in France, is to their form of government.' The Oath of Supremacy I have already mentioned: the Oath, ſtyled in our Statutes the Oath of Abjuration, is ſimply an oath, firſt, of Allegiance to His Majeſty; next, of ſupport of the Settlement of the Crown, as limited by an Act of Parliament, entitled, *An Act for the further Limitation of the Crown, and better ſecuring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject*; and next an Oath

abjuring

abjuring all allegiance to the deſcendants of the late King James the Second. This Oath, together with the Oaths of Supremacy, and a general Oath of Allegiance, are all the oaths enjoined to be taken by Members of Parliament. How contemptible then is the ignorance of this Author, who ſtates, that this Oath of Abjuration is a violent inſult to the religion of our allies, the firſt nations in Europe!

The Iriſh Popery Code, which this Author complains of, was enacted after the acceſſion of King William and Queen Mary: not all at once, but from time to time, as ſeemed expedient, in ſeveral ſucceſſive Seſſions of the Iriſh Parliaments, from the 4th of William and Mary to the 8th of Anne incluſive, but chiefly in the 2d and 8th of Anne. By this Code Romaniſts were prohibited to teach ſchool, and to take leaſes of lands for a longer term than thirty-one years, or to acquire by purchaſe any more durable intereſt in lands. It provided, that if the eldeſt ſon of a Romaniſt, having an eſtate in fee, conformed to the Proteſtant Religion, his father, from the time of his conformity, became tenant for life of his eſtate, the fee veſted in the conforming ſon, ſubject to the debts and incumbrances, and the Lord Chancellor was empowered to charge the eſtate with fortunes for the younger children, not exceeding in the whole one third of the full value of it. When a Romaniſt died ſeiſed of an eſtate in fee, if his eldeſt ſon did not conform to the Proteſtant Religion within a year and a day after his father's death (if he was then of full age, or, if then a minor, within a year and a day after he had attained his full age), the eſtate gavelled between him and his brothers. No Romaniſt could enjoy an office

fice in the State, a commiſſion in the Army, or a ſeat in Parliament, without taking the Teſt Oaths. Theſe are the parts of the Popery Code, whoſe dire effects on the Iriſh Romaniſts this Author ſo pathetically laments, and magnifies with ſuch monſtrous exaggeration. It is neceſſary here to remark, that theſe laws were all enacted from abſolute neceſſity: that the reiterated rebellions, treaſons, and maſſacres of the Iriſh Romaniſts were the cauſes of their enaction: that they were enacted after the Iriſh Romaniſts had been completely ſubdued in a deſperate war, waged by them againſt their Proteſtant countrymen and the Engliſh nation, and undertaken by them, under the pretence of ſupporting the title of an abdicated Monarch to the Crown; but really for the purpoſe of ſeparating Ireland from Great Britain, and allying it with France: that in this war the nation was deſolated from one extremity to the other, as it had been frequently before in ſimilar precedent rebellions: that it became evidently detrimental to the State, to permit Iriſh Romaniſts to acquire landed eſtates, giving them an intereſt in the country, which their avowed principles inevitably led them to uſe for the ſubverſion of the State: that the incurable diſpoſition of the Iriſh Romaniſts to rebellion and maſſacre was not the effect, but the cauſe, of the Popery Code; for that diſpoſition led them to the moſt flagrant, cruel, and reiterated acts of rebellion and maſſacre, before the enaction of that Code; and all other ways of preventing the repetition of ſuch horrible crimes had been found ineffectual: that this Author is guilty of the baſeſt deception, in ſtating the Popery Code to be the cauſe of Rebellions, when it was only the effect: that the parts of that Code, of which he complains, as provocations of Iriſh Romaniſts

to Rebellion, were repealed, before the laſt Iriſh rebellion and maſſacre; and conſequently could not be the cauſe of them: and it is no unfair deduction, that the re-enaction of a Code, which, while it continued to be a part of the law of the land, prevented Rebellion, may become neceſſary for the protection of the country from ſimilar future calamities.

This Author ſtates, that, by the repealed Popery Code, *Romaniſts were excluded from Proteſtant Schools.* This is a direct falſehood: Romaniſts, ſo far from being excluded from Proteſtant ſchools, were invited to them; every Proteſtant ſchool in the kingdom was always open to them; they might have freely reſorted thither for inſtruction in all kinds of learning, without any interference of the ſchoolmaſters with their religious opinions. Schools were eſtabliſhed by Government, above half a century ago, for the education of the children of the poorer claſs of Iriſh Romaniſts, who had the privilege of ſending their children to theſe ſchools, if they thought fit, to be educated and maintained *gratis:* theſe ſchools are called *Charter Schools*, and the ſcholars are educated in the Proteſtant Religion, as it is but reaſonable that children educated at the expenſe of the State, ſhould be inſtructed in the Religion of the State. But all other ſchools were as open to Romaniſts as to Proteſtants, without any reference to, or interference with, the religious opinions of Romaniſts. The State has lately, but before this Author publiſhed his pamphlet, thought fit to erect a moſt magnificent College, at an amazing expenſe, near Dublin, for the excluſive education of Romiſh Prieſts, whether wiſely or not, I will not preſume

ſume to determine. I ſhall have occaſion hereafter more fully to notice this foundation.

Romiſh ſtudents could not obtain degrees in the Univerſity of Dublin without taking the Oaths of Abjuration and Supremacy, previous to the repeal of the Popery Code: but by the act of the Iriſh Parliament in 1793 in favour of Romaniſts, they are rendered capable of taking degrees in that Univerſity.

Romiſh ſchoolmaſters were by the Popery Code prohibited to teach. No prohibition, at the time it was enacted, could be more reaſonable: they inculcated the rudiments of ſedition and treaſon with the utmoſt care in their ſcholars; and when proper ſchools were open for the inſtruction of Romaniſts, it was a wiſe and juſt proviſion of the State to prevent their reſort to places where they were early initiated in all the principles of diſaffection to the Government. It appeared in the laſt Rebellion, that the Romiſh ſchoolmaſters were the moſt zealous, active, and buſy propagators of all the doctrines of treaſon in the country. The propriety of the education of Iriſh Romaniſts in France and Spain, after their various rebellions in confederacy with theſe powers, needs no argument to ſupport it.

This Author's next complaint againſt the Popery Code is, 'that it cramped the induſtry of the people, and 'armed the brother againſt the brother, and rewarded 'the ſon for betraying the father, rendered property in-'ſecure, prevented the cultivation of land, the interior 'confidence of families, and the extenſion of trade.'

Romaniſts by that Code were forbidden to take a leaſe of land for a longer term than thirty-one years. Againſt that clauſe it is to be ſuppoſed that the accuſation of cramping the induſtry of the people is levelled. It is admitted that a larger proportion of Romaniſts is to be found among the Iriſh peaſantry, than among the other claſſes of inhabitants; and it is to be noted that this author, by the word People, means Romaniſts excluſively; for throughout his pamphlet, like other writers of his kidney, he inſinuates that the Iriſh Proteſtants are ſo inſignificant in number, that they are not worthy of being noticed as a part of the people. It is difficult to prove, though eaſy to aſſert, that a claſs of the farmers of a nation, the cultivators of the ſoil, are cramped in their induſtry, and their cultivation obſtructed, by their diſability to acquire more durable intereſts in their farms, than leaſes for thirty-one years give them; and that ſuch diſability in one claſs of farmers cramps the induſtry of the whole body. The farmers in many parts of England, the moſt ſkilful in their profeſſion of any in the world, the moſt induſtrious and thriving, have no leaſes of their farms, but are yearly tenants: in moſt parts of England long leaſes of farms are unuſual, in ſome parts unknown: a ſeven years leaſe of a farm is conſidered a ſufficient tenure, yet the farmers are remarkable for their excellent cultivation of the land, and the moſt active induſtry. It is therefore proved by experience, that diſability in farmers to acquire long tenures of their farms is no impediment to national induſtry. The law in particular complained of, never operated againſt the induſtry of the Romiſh farmers, but it operated againſt the acquiſition of permanent landed eſtates by ſuch Iriſh Romaniſts as had acquired large perſonal property, becauſe all laws againſt

againſt ſuch acquiſition may be eaſily evaded by long leaſes. Such was the intention of the Legiſlature, and it acted wiſely, and for the benefit and ſecurity of the State (as is already ſhown), in enacting the clauſe complained of: Romaniſts were not reſtrained from exerting their induſtry, and acquiring large perſonal eſtates; but they were prohibited to expend their money in the purchaſe of lands, becauſe the ſafety of the State required ſuch prohibition: and induſtry may be, and is, exerted as ſtrenuouſly in the acquiſition of perſonal, as of real property; of which the Britiſh nation is a ſhining example. The ſophiſtry of the aſſertion, that the induſtry of a whole nation was cramped, becauſe a prohibition of the acquiſition of permanent landed eſtates by a part, and that the pooreſt part of it, exiſted, even admitting a cramping quality in the prohibition, is too glaring and contemptible to require further notice.

The next accuſation of this Author againſt the Popery Code is, *that it rewarded the ſon for betraying the father, and armed the brother againſt the brother.* The part of the Code againſt which this accuſation is levelled, is that which enacts, that the conformity to the Proteſtant Religion of the eldeſt ſon of a Romaniſt, ſeiſed in fee of a landed eſtate, ſhall render his father tenant for life, and veſt the remainder in fee in the ſon, ſubject however to the payment of real incumbrances, the juſt debts of the father, and of reaſonable portions to the younger children, at the diſcretion of the Chancellor: and the father was compellable to make ſome reaſonable allowance for the ſupport of the conforming child. And alſo that part of the Code which enacted, that the landed eſtate of a Romaniſt ſhould be gavelable among all his

ſons, in caſe the eldeſt did not conform to the Proteſtant Religion within a year and a day after the death of his father, if then of the age of twenty-one years; or if not, within a year and a day after he had attained that age.

As to the firſt clauſe, it is conformable to the rules of juſtice, of right reaſon, and of nature. The father is bound by the law of nature to ſupport and provide for his children, and by the common law of the land, the eldeſt ſon is entitled to ſucceed his father in his landed eſtate, in caſe the father makes no diſpoſition of it in his lifetime, by conveyance or will. It is notorious that every Romiſh father would, on the conformity of his eldeſt ſon to the Proteſtant Religion (which he would conſider as apoſtacy), not only withdraw all ſupport from him during his own life, but diſinherit him: the fear of which would be an effectual bar to his conformity, be he ever ſo well inclined to it. This Code, therefore, in caſe of the ſon's conformity, required the father to do no more than what the law of nature and the common law of the land required him to do; and reſtrained him only from tranſgreſſing both, from the impulſe of a blind bigotry. The payment of his juſt debts, and the proviſion of his other children, were ſecured, with the enjoyment of his eſtate during his life. How unjuſt then is the cenſure of this author on this clauſe of the Popery Code, that it rewarded the ſon for betraying the father!

In reſpect to the gavelling clauſe, on the non-conformity of the eldeſt ſon, it is to be obſerved, that the diviſion of the landed eſtates of a deceaſed father among his ſons in equal portions, is ſo far from being counted a

hardſhip in many nations of Europe, that it is the law in many of them at this day. It is now the common law of the county of Kent: it was the law of our Saxon anceſtors. The laws of male Primogeniture, as they are at this day, in reſpect to the deſcent of real eſtates, were introduced by the feudal ſyſtem imported with William the Conqueror. The men of Kent inſiſted on retention of their old gavel law, and he conceded it to them. (See Blackſtone's Commentaries, vol. ii. page 84. vol. iv. page 406, octavo edition.) The law of deſcent of landed eſtates to the eldeſt, in excluſion of the other children, does not take place in reſpect to daughters; ſuch eſtates deſcend to daughters in gavelkind. Many writers on civil polity, of great eminence, maintain the opinion, that the law of Gavelkind is more advantageous to the State, than that of Primogeniture: and it is agreed by all, that the accumulation of great landed eſtates in one family, to be inherited by one perſon, an effect of the law of Primogeniture, is dangerous in a State, whether monarchical, republican, or mixt. It became neceſſary, for the reaſon I have already mentioned, to diminiſh the intereſt of Iriſh Romaniſts, derived from their enjoyment of large landed eſtates; and this law was deſigned to effect that purpoſe, with the leaſt poſſible diſadvantage to individuals, and without having recourſe to any meaſure, which could be deemed by reaſonable men either harſh or unjuſt; it was wiſely calculated to anſwer all theſe ends. If therefore it has the effect of arming brother againſt brother among Iriſh Romaniſts, it muſt be admitted that they are very prone to family hoſtility; and to ſuch propenſity, and not to the law, is ſuch hoſtility to be attributed: for the law is in itſelf fair and equal, and its juſtice vouched for

by the uſage of ſeveral European nations, and a part of our own.

The next complaint of this Author againſt the Popery Code is, *that it rendered property inſecure.* What part of it is alluded to, as rendering property inſecure, it is hard to gueſs: perhaps it is that part of the Code, which enacts, that if a Romaniſt ſhall acquire by purchaſe an eſtate in lands, contrary to its prohibitions, ſuch eſtate ſhall become forfeitable to the firſt Proteſtant, who ſhall diſcover it, and file a bill for the recovery of it. Laws which, by the wiſdom of their proviſions, tend to enſure the execution of them, are juſtly eſteemed the moſt effectual, for the correction of thoſe evils which they are enacted to repreſs: of ſuch nature was this clauſe of the Popery Code. The State, for the reaſons already mentioned, deemed it expedient to prohibit the acquiſition of landed eſtates by Romaniſts; if therefore Romaniſts attempted to elude or defeat the effect of theſe laws, and expended their money in the purchaſe of landed eſtates, knowing the prohibition and the penalty, they had no ground to complain that their property was inſecure, becauſe ſuch eſtates became forfeited to the firſt Proteſtant diſcoverer: the forfeiture was the conſequence of their own tranſgreſſions of the law, and their attempts to evade it: the landed eſtates ſo purchaſed by them never were their lawful property; and if they riſked their property on ſuch unlawful ſpeculations, they themſelves, and not the law, were the cauſe of its inſecurity.

This Author next ſtates, *that the Popery Code prevented the extenſion of trade, and employment of the talents and genius of three fourths of the people in civil and military affairs.* This

Code muſt have rather tended to extend trade, than to confine it: becauſe it prevented whatever Romiſh capital there was in the kingdom from being diverted to the purchaſe of lands, and being thereby withdrawn from trade. And as to the talents and genius of two thirds, and not of three fourths of the people of Ireland (the moſt indigent and uninformed claſs of ſociety), being excluded from all interference with the civil or military concerns of the Britiſh Empire,—the brave, enlightened Proteſtant ſubjects of that empire, out-numbering them in the proportion of ſix to one, wanted no aſſiſtance from them. Theſe two thirds of the Iriſh population, and their anceſtors, had for ages exerted their talents, civil and military, ſuch as they were, for the ſubverſion of the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment in Church and State; and it was found policy to reject all hollow alliance of talent of ſuch Subjects, for the conduct of the national energies either in peace or war. The Britiſh Empire was, and is ſupported, *non tali auxilio, nec defenſoribus iſtis!*

All this Author's complaints againſt the Iriſh Popery Code, and his monſtrous exaggerations and falſehoods reſpecting its proviſions and effects, have been now fully canvaſſed and expoſed. And as this Code, in all the parts complained of, and acrimoniouſly miſrepreſented by him, with the view of inflaming the Iriſh Romaniſts to another Rebellion, is now repealed, his performance would not have been ſo much noticed, had not ſeveral pamphlets publiſhed in England as the ſubſtance of Speeches reſpecting the Union, ſpoken in the Britiſh Houſes of Lords and Commons, by the moſt powerful Noblemen and Commoners in England, contained paſſages expreſſive of the opinions of the ſpeakers, that Iriſh

Romaniſts have been cruelly oppreſſed by their Proteſtant fellow-ſubjects, without any juſt reaſon to warrant ſuch ſuppoſed oppreſſions: and that the numbers and ſtrength of Iriſh Romaniſts were ſo great, when compared with thoſe of Iriſh Proteſtants, that it is neceſſary to purchaſe their conſent to an Union, at the price of the ſacrifice of the Proteſtant eſtabliſhment in Ireland. As I have taken up my pen, chiefly for the purpoſe of diſabuſing ſuch Noblemen and Gentlemen, and giving them true information of the real ſtate of Ireland, with which ſome of them of the greateſt rank ſeem not only unacquainted, but, what is worſe, ſeem to have very falſe impreſſions made upon them to the diſadvantage of the Iriſh Proteſtants, I thought I could not omit refuting the ſhameleſs ſlanders of this writer, on the laws and government of Ireland for this century paſt. Such refutation is alſo conformable to my general plan, which is to expoſe, confute, and overthrow the ſyſtem of Burkiſm reſpecting Ireland; which, as theſe Speeches too evidently prove, has made no inconſiderable progreſs among the Miniſters of the Britiſh Empire; and which has its foundation deeply laid in bigotry, miſrepreſentation, falſehood, and deceit: to the operations of which ſyſtem in Ireland, directed by the Miniſters ſent thither from England, from time to time, for theſe twenty years paſt, are juſtly to be attributed the calamities which have ſo lately afflicted it; and the diſſent of a conſiderable body of Iriſh Proteſtants, from an Incorporating Union with Great Britain, from a ſuſpicion (ill-founded, as I hope and believe, yet not altogether groundleſs), that ſome dangerous invaſion of the Conſtitution of the Empire is, at leaſt, meditated, under the ſhadow and protection of that moſt ſalutary meaſure.

I ſhall

I ſhall take my leave of this Author, by a ſhort comment on the following paragraph contained in page 16 of his pamphlet: 'In Ireland, the Religion of the *people* is not 'permitted to be the Religion of the country: it is *ſcarcely* '*tolerated:* the Religion of a *ſmall minority* (a political 'phenomenon) is the eſtabliſhed Religion of the State.' This Author has a rare talent at condenſing a variety of falſehoods into one ſhort paſſage. *Popery enjoys the moſt complete toleration.* The Religion of one third of the inhabitants of Ireland in number, of forty to one in property, is the eſtabliſhed Religion of the State, in Ireland; it is alſo the Religion of ſix to one in number, and of one hundred to one in property, of the population of the Britiſh Empire in Europe, of which Ireland is a limb: *it is therefore the Religion of an infinite majority of the inhabitants of the Empire reckoned both by numbers and property.* I have quoted this laſt paſſage, juſt to ſhow the audacity of the writer, and the eaſe and confidence with which he advances the moſt impudent falſehoods, and ſupports them with the moſt pitiful ſophiſtry.

It has been alledged, that Ireland has manifeſtly improved in trade and cultivation ſince the repeal of the Popery Code, and that ſuch improvement is the effect of that repeal. The improvement of Ireland from the year 1780 to the breaking out of the late Rebellion is admitted; but it is not to be attributed to the repeal of the Popery Code, but to the free trade about that time conceded to Ireland by Great Britain, and the abolition of thoſe commercial regulations, with which ſhe had before that period ſhackled Ireland; and part of the improvement is to be laid to the account of the ruin of the trade of France and Holland,

and

and the rapid increaſe of that of the Britiſh Empire in general, within that period.

Strictures on a pamphlet entitled, 'Conſiderations on the State of Public Affairs in the Year 1799. Ireland.'

I fear I have waſted too much paper and ink in expoſing this Writer, his falſehoods, miſrepreſentations, ignorance, and ſophiſtry; but I have already given my reaſon for ſo doing, and the ſame reaſon is my excuſe to the public for taking notice of the pamphlet entitled, '*Conſiderations upon the State of Public Affairs in the Year* 1799. *Ireland.*' After reading this publication, it appeared to me ſo very falſe, abuſive, abſurd, and contemptible, that I at firſt thought it degrading to any reaſonable perſon, to ſuffer it to occupy any part of his attention; my feeling was pretty much the ſame with that of Quin the player, when a celebrated actreſs once gave him a pluck by the wig in the Green-room: 'Madam,' ſaid he, turning to her, 'I would ſpit in your face, only that would be taking notice of you.' However, on further reflection, and on finding by the Speeches already mentioned, that Burkiſm had made a great progreſs among Britiſh Stateſmen, I began to perceive, that lies, the moſt monſtrous that ever were invented reſpecting the State and Government of Ireland, and its Proteſtant inhabitants, had gained credit in England, with men who had power to do infinite miſchief if they were not undeceived. I therefore thought it prudent to waſte a little more paper and ink, even on this infamous, malevolent, anonymous ſlanderer. But my Strictures on his libel ſhall be very ſhort, becauſe, in my Obſervations on the preceding Author, the reader will find all the poſitions of the Author of '*Conſiderations, &c.*' fully refuted.

This

This Writer introduces himſelf to the public under the maſk of a violent partiſan of the meaſure of an Incorporating Union of Great Britain and Ireland: but he wears a very thin maſk; for through it may be very diſtinctly ſeen the envenomed, enthuſiaſtic Iriſh friar, juſt diſcharged on the nation from the mortar of a Spaniſh monaſtery: all the acrimony, all the falſehood, all the ignorance, all the bigotry, all the fury, in ſhort, all the combuſtibles of ſo noiſome a compoſition! He purſues the following line of attack, ſupported by exploſions of bombs, carcaſſes, and ſtink-pots, on the Proteſtants of Ireland.

He gives the titles of Engliſh Coloniſts, Planters, and Settlers, to the Iriſh Proteſtants; and that of Natives to the Iriſh Romaniſts; and throughout aſſerts, that the Proteſtants are a Britiſh colony, and a handful only when compared with the natives. He ſtates, 'that the Iriſh 'Parliament is only the repreſentative of this handful 'of coloniſts, and not the repreſentative of the natives, 'or of any part of them;' and ſtyles it throughout, in deriſion, 'the *Parliament of Dublin*.' He ſtates, that 'there 'are in this Parliament of Dublin (meaning the Houſe of 'Commons) one hundred and ſixteen placemen, out of 'three hundred of which it conſiſts; and that all its pro-'ceedings are the effects of fear and corruption: *that it 'is elected by Engliſhmen, and compoſed of Engliſhmen, to the 'excluſion of the ancient occupants of the ſoil.*' (See page 41.) He calls all Iriſh Proteſtants 'the Grantees of Cromwell 'and William the Third, the children of their ſoldiers, 'and the heirs of their rapacity.' He accuſes theſe two perſonages, whom he inſolently ranks together, 'with 'the greateſt violence and exceſſes, and with the ex-'actions of the moſt grievous confiſcations and forfeitures

'from

' from the natives.' (See page 24.) He ſtates the Proteſtants of Ireland to be ' the moſt wretched, ill-go-
' verned, and dependent colony on the face of the globe.'
(See page 14.) He deſcribes the Government of Ireland
' as a perpetual military government, the Iriſh Pro-
' teſtants, as having a trembling dependance upon the
' Crown of England for a daily and precarious exiſtence.'
(See page 5.) He thus paints the ſituation and ſenti-
ment of the Iriſh Proteſtants and Romaniſts with reſpect
to each other, when obſerving on the effects of the Britiſh
Act of renunciation of the power of legiſlating for Ire-
land in the year 1782: ' They (the Romaniſts) knew
' that the repreſentatives of a Proteſtant colony would
' not, and could not *dare* to truſt the *immenſe* majority of
' their nation with an equality of political rights and con-
' dition; they ſaw that what they looked for, from the power
' and magnanimity of Britain, became hopeleſs from the
' hands of *ſettlers*, whoſe *weakneſs* made them *jealous* and
' *afraid*. They were too conſcious of their own *ſtrength*,
' too fond of their *title*, to deſire or expect that they
' ſhould be ever truſted by an *uſurper* (the Proteſtant Go-
' vernment), whoſe *force* they *deſpiſed*, and whoſe *right*
' they *diſputed*: they felt themſelves abandoned and
' turned over to the generoſity of a handful of proprietors,
' who were too *powerleſs* and too *timid* to be merciful:
' and if the independent Parliament had been *compelled* to
' make the conceſſion, they would have been too ſen-
' ſible of the cauſe from which it ſprung, would have
' called it *fear*, and not *liberality*, and they would have
' ſeized the proffered boon, not as ſatisfaction and con-
' tent, *but as a ſtep in the ladder of their ambition, and an*
' *advanced poſt in the march of revenge*.' (See pages 51, 52.)

In

In the very middle of this torrent of abuſe on the Proteſtants and Parliament of Ireland, and panegyric on the Romaniſts; this diſplay of the uſurpation, weakneſs, and timidity of the Proteſtants; and of the ſtrength and magnanimity of the Romaniſts, and juſtice of their claims of power, dominion, and excluſive poſſeſſion of the kingdom, is to be met the following curious ſentence, which I inſert as a ſpecimen of the Author's modeſty and conſiſtency: '*I draw a veil over every thing that can diſguſt or inflame.*' He then proceeds thus further to draw his veil: '*Though I have heard the offer of Union condemned, and the ſalvation of a few aſſerted to depend upon the extirpation of the majority; that the Catholics muſt be extinguiſhed, and put out; that not a ſingle Rohilla of them all can be left with impunity; though I have heard ſuch ſanguinary doctrines pollute the walls of a Houſe of Parliament.*' (See pages 63, 64.)

This Author then takes care to diſtinguiſh the United Iriſhmen, whoſe barbarities were too notorious to be denied, or openly palliated, from the Iriſh Romaniſts; and to lay to the charge of the United Iriſhmen, as diſtinct from the Romaniſts, the guilt of the late Rebellion; but even here he cannot forbear falling furiouſly on the Proteſtants of Ireland for their reſiſtance to this Rebellion, and their audacity in preſuming to defend their lives and properties from the Romiſh Rebels, and in attempting to puniſh them for the crimes they had committed. The late *Maſſacre and Rebellion*, with all due tenderneſs for the Romiſh inſurgents, he calls a *Civil War*. 'I confeſs,' ſays he, 'I fear there are among our ſettlers in Ireland 'ſome unrelenting minds, who expect and prefer another 'concluſion of the conteſt, and very different from ours: '*the horrible principle which has been diſcloſed even in Eng-*

'*land*

'*land* (alluding to the Rohilla principle) induces me very 'ſtrongly to apprehend, that there is no obſtacle in a part 'of the Colony more hoſtile and formidable to the pro-'jected Union, than the hope to be enabled, by the arms 'and treaſure of the mother-country, to obtain ſuch de-'cided and definitive ſucceſs in the *Civil War*, as to en-'able their independent Parliament to attaint and confiſ-'cate the remaining part of the property of Ireland, not 'actually in the occupation of that Colony.' Then, after expreſſing his hope, that His Majeſty will never give the Royal aſſent to bills for the attainder of the Iriſh Rebels, or confiſcation of their property, and conſequently that, if vanquiſhed, they will eſcape all puniſhment; he proceeds thus further to cover with his *veil*, every thing that can diſguſt Iriſh Proteſtants, or inflame Iriſh Romaniſts: 'If 'the only obſtacle to Union in the boſom of our Colony, 'is this criminal and flagitious hope, of deriving from our 'victories an unjuſt and miſerable ſucceſs of ſlavery and 'plunder; I am fearful that it is impoſſible to aſſign, 'after every allowance for paſſion and for prejudice, a 'better or more pardonable plea, for the refuſal or the 'ſilence of the Catholic. *Revenge* and the hope of prey 'are his undiſguiſed motives, and he is only ſo far *leſs* ab-'ſurd, or *leſs* guilty than the coloniſt I have deſcribed, *as* 'he believes himſelf to have a right, according to the doctrines 'of Impreſcriptibility, to poſſeſs the lands which no time, no 'length of poſſeſſion can alienate, no acquieſcence transfer.' (See pages from 65 to 69.)

Under pretence of condemning the infidelity of the French Republicans, he introduces a panegyric on the Iriſh Romiſh Biſhops; deſcribing them, *as men of learn-*

ing,

ing, humanity, and piety (page 71): and under pretence of reconciling Iriſh Romaniſts to the meaſure of an Union, he takes an occaſion of paſſing the higheſt encomiums on the whole party; not forgetting, by way of praiſing their patience and forbearance, to ſtate, 'that they have been 'moſt grievouſly oppreſſed by the Colony; that their ap-'petite for revenge, and their exertions in the purſuit of it '(that is, their Rebellions), were juſtifiable;' but then he *meekly* exhorts them to ſacrifice their *revenge*, 'becauſe it 'is *almoſt ſatiated* in ſeas of *Civil blood:* that a great change 'is propounded to them, and they are called to the rights 'of citizenſhip by the projected Union;' and *piouſly* aſks the clerical Iriſh Romaniſt, '*will he defer to unfurl the* '*ſacred banner*, and to call back the deluded Rebel from 'the colours of Infidelity?' that is, from his alliance with France, 'which nation,' he ſays, 'knows the cruel power 'of artifice and deſign *upon the devout and agitated boſom* '*of poor and honeſt ignorance, ſacrificing all things, ſuffering* '*all things, and daring all things, in the cauſe ſuppoſed of* '*Religion.*' (See from page 72 to 76.) The author then ſtates, 'that England cannot ſupport her Colony in its 'preſent ſtate; that it were better for England, that her 'Colony and the whole iſland of Ireland were precipitated 'to the bottom of the ſea, or blotted from the map, and 'expunged from the liſt of nations, than that ſhe ſhould 'remain a diverſion of her power and force, an arſenal of 'attack and injury, and a devouring gulf of her blood 'and reſources in the preſent war.' (See page 79.) He then aſſerts, 'that *there are three millions of wretched na-*'*tives*, whom the Iriſh Proteſtant cannot oppreſs but by 'the arms of England, nor deliver but with his own 'ruin.' (See page 84.) 'That the natives have been always

'oppreſſed

' oppreſſed by the Colony, and that they have no hopes of ' reprieve and ſafety, but in the grant of *Complete Eman-* ' *cipation*: that the Proteſtant Government of Ireland is ' veſted in a repreſentative body, the majority of which ' are placemen and aſpirants of the Law, and in a factious ' ariſtocracy which outweighs even corruption.' (See pages 88, 89.) ' That the natives or Catholics' (for he ſometimes calls the Iriſh Romaniſts by the one name, ſometimes by the other; but the Proteſtants invariably Coloniſts, Planters, and Settlers) ' cannot expect eman- ' cipation from the *Parliament of Dublin.* Will a handful ' of men emancipate a multitude? Will an armed regi- ' ment liberate a diſarmed hoſt? It is a myſtery not very ' profound, that *Fear* is a *coward*, that *Weakneſs* cannot ' confide, and that *Injury* never pardons.'—' The Par- ' liament of Ireland' (here the Author nodded, he meant the Parliament of Dublin), ' dares not ſet him (the Ca- ' tholic) free. It is the Imperial Parliament, it is the ' power, greatneſs, and ſuperiority of England which alone ' can break *his chains*, or contain him in the firſt tranſ- ' ports of *Liberty.* Will the native refuſe the boon (the ' Union) at the end *of ſix centuries of calamity, of fruitleſs* ' *ſtruggles, and tenacious oppreſſion?*' (See page 91.) Then ſtill under the pretence of recommending the Union, he proceeds to throw the covering of his veil over every thing that can diſguſt or inflame, by the following in- vective on the Colony: ' The Union is neceſſary, becauſe ' the alternative that remains, is ſuch as nature ſickens ' at, as humanity rejects, as inſtinct flies from, becauſe ' it is rebellion and military government, becauſe it is ' impriſonment, torture, and ſudden execution: becauſe ' it is armed proſecutors and juries of ſoldiers, with *their* ' *Serjeants learned in the Law:* (witty rogue!) becauſe it

' is

'is the curfew and the paſſport bill; becauſe it is in-
'vaſion, maſſacre, rape, and pillage, and conflagration;
'becauſe it is the wretchedeſt and moſt degrading condi-
'tion of humanity, the moſt diſguſting ſeries of miſery
'and guilt, the blackeſt and moſt lengthened ſcene and
'proceſſion of crimes and ſufferings, that ever humbled
'or afflicted man.' (See pages 93, 94.)

He then proceeds to ſtate a dilemma to the Iriſh Proteſtant: *you muſt either agree to an Union, or grant Emancipation to the Romaniſts;* and ſhows that the laſt horn will gore him to death, the firſt only ſlightly wound him: 'if,' ſays he, 'you determine on the laſt meaſure, you receive 'a Catholic Parliament, you are ruined if the doors of 'Parliament are opened to a Catholic majority, if you 'divide your power with three millions of malcontents.' (See pages 94, 95.) Admitting here, that though the Romaniſts ſhall in his ſenſe be emancipated, yet they will remain malcontents; and that if they are admitted into Parliament, they will ſoon form the majority.

His laſt argument to induce Iriſh Romaniſts to agree to an Union is, that they will be admitted to ſeats in the Imperial Parliament; that is, as he expreſſes it, they will be *completely emancipated.*

I have now laboured through this moſt diſguſting performance, and laid before the reader an epitome of the doctrines contained in it in the language of the author. I now proceed to make a few ſhort remarks on it, juſt to point out to the Britiſh reader its falſehoods and abſurdity: to ſhow that the whole tenour of it militates againſt its pretended purpoſe; and that the Author himſelf meant it as

a juſtification of the recent and all former Rebellions of the Iriſh Romaniſts, of all their maſſacres, robberies, and conflagrations ; as a vehicle of all manner of invective and ſlander againſt the Iriſh Proteſtants, and the Engliſh Government in Ireland; and as a provocative to the Iriſh Romaniſts to recommence hoſtilities againſt their Proteſtant fellow-ſubjects, and ſtimulate them to revenge and murder.

I will begin with making an obſervation or two, on his ſtyling Iriſh Proteſtants Coloniſts, and Iriſh Romaniſts Natives. His firſt view in diſtinguiſhing the inhabitants of Ireland into theſe two claſſes, was, that he might indulge the rancour of an Iriſh Romaniſt againſt Iriſh Proteſtants by the more unbridled abuſe, from conviction that Engliſh Proteſtants would not attend patiently to ſuch reviling of their fellow Proteſtants, under the title of Proteſtants, and for no other cauſe than their being Proteſtants. The Americans, as was the general opinion, had not conducted themſelves with gratitude towards the mother-country, and he hoped to divert the reſentment of the inhabitants of Great Britain againſt the American coloniſts for their ſeceſſion, on the heads of the Iriſh Proteſtants; by ſtyling them Coloniſts, and repreſenting that their late partial rejection of an Incorporating Union with Great Britain was a plain proof, that they intended to follow the example of the American coloniſts, and break off all connexion with Great Britain. Another and his principal purpoſe was, to juſtify the Iriſh rebellions and maſſacres, and to induce the Britiſh nation to believe, that they were only the ſtruggles of the oppreſſed natives of Ireland, to free themſelves from the tyranny of a handful of coloniſts, wrongful intruders on their ſoil and property, and rapacious plunderers ;

plunderers; and thereby to induce Great Britain to join them in cruſhing ſo flagitious, ſo contemptible, and ſo feeble a band of monopoliſts; who, though unable to maintain their ill-gotten poſſeſſions againſt the natives, the right owners, without the aſſiſtance of Great Britain, yet had the audacity to reject an Incorporating Union. The Writer knew that the Britiſh nation could not be led into a co-operation with Iriſh Romaniſts, in ſo wicked a ſcheme as the deſtruction of the Proteſtants of Ireland, but by artifice and cunning: he hoped to make ſuch a ſcheme palatable, and to veil it from the eyes of the Britiſh nation at large, by the ſubſtitution of the words *Natives* and *Coloniſts*, in the place of *Papiſts* and *Proteſtants*.

That he is himſelf an Iriſh Romaniſt is notorious from many paſſages in his pamphlet, though he endeavours, awkwardly, to conceal it; as ſome of his countrymen in converſation attempt, ludicrouſly enough, to paſs themſelves for natives of Britain, by an affected imitation of Engliſh provincial tones, and muzzling the Iriſh brogue. And one of his main purpoſes is, to excite the Iriſh Romaniſts to a new rebellion and maſſacre, by deſcribing the Iriſh Proteſtants as a handful of coloniſts, outcaſts from their own country, and deſperate adventurers, the proper objects of the vengeance of the natives; and this purpoſe he ſo little conceals, that he has in ſeveral paſſages repreſented, in expreſs terms, the propenſity of Iriſh Romaniſts to *revenge*, that is, to rebellion, as very juſtifiable. If the Britiſh nation could be induced by ſuch baſe arts to concur in the deſtruction of the Iriſh Proteſtants (which could be effected by the power of Britain confederated with the maſs of Iriſh Romaniſts), this Writer well knew, that the ſure foundation of Britiſh influence and power

in Ireland would be uprooted; and, as he well knew the irreconcilable hoſtility of the Iriſh Romaniſts to a Proteſtant Britiſh Government, he was convinced that ſuch an event as the deſtruction of the Iriſh Proteſtants would be immediately followed by an attempt of the Iriſh Romaniſts to ſeparate themſelves, with the aſſiſtance of France (whoſe politics he fraudulently pretends to reprobate), from Great Britain, and to eſtabliſh an independent Romiſh Republic in Ireland; and I have already ſhown that this is the avowed intention of the whole Romiſh party in that kingdom. Such is the fraud of diſtinguiſhing the inhabitants of Ireland into *Coloniſts* and *Natives*, rather than into *Proteſtants* and *Romaniſts!* I will now ſhow the falſehood and abſurdity of the diſtinction.

Geraldus Cambrenſis, otherwiſe Gerald Barry (who was, in the reign of King Henry the Second, Biſhop of St. David's in Wales, Hiſtoriographer and Secretary to Henry, a man, for that age, of great learning, and the perſon whom he ſent into Ireland with his ſon John, when he created him King of Ireland), Roger Hoveden, Matthew Paris, and all the ancient Engliſh hiſtorians, agree in giving the following account of the acquiſition of Ireland by the Engliſh Monarchs: In the reign of Henry the Second, Ireland was divided into certain *ſuffragan kingdoms* (if I may ſo call them), ſubject to one Monarch, as principal King or Emperor, to whom the other Kings paid much the ſame homage as the German Electors at preſent to his Imperial Majeſty. Inteſtine wars drove one of theſe petty Kings from his own country: he fled into England, and implored the aſſiſtance of Henry to enable him to regain his territories.

Henry,

Henry, after ſending ſome adventurers before him to ſmooth the way, went into Ireland at the head of a conſiderable army, in the year 1172, above ſix hundred years ago. The Iriſh nation, worried by continual inteſtine war, univerſally received him as a deliverer. All the Reguli and Chiefs of the nation, with the chief Monarch himſelf, threw their crowns at his feet: they, with the whole body of the Biſhops and Clergy, elected him King or Lord of the whole iſland, and ſwore allegiance to him. He accepted the dominion, and agreed with them, *that they ſhould enjoy the like liberties and immunities, and be governed by the ſame mild laws, both civil and eccleſiaſtical, as the people of England.* Henry afterwards, in the twenty-fifth year of his reign, created his ſon John, under the ſtyle and title of Lord of Ireland, King of that country; for he thereby enjoyed all manner of kingly juriſdiction, pre-eminence, and authority. Richard the Firſt, eldeſt brother of John, afterwards died without iſſue, on which event John became King of England, and the ſovereignty of the two nations became again veſted in the ſame perſon. Henry the Third, ſon of John, in November 1216, gave a Magna Charta to Ireland, word for word the ſame as that which he eight years afterwards granted to his kingdom of England, ſave the neceſſary alterations in the names of places. By the Iriſh Statute of the 33d of Henry the Eighth, chap. 1, the King's ſtyle of Lord of Ireland was changed to that of King, becauſe, as the preamble recites, '*the* '*King, under the ſtyle and title of Lord of Ireland, enjoyed* '*all manner of kingly juriſdiction, pre-eminence, and au-* '*thority in Ireland, belonging to the imperial ſtate and ma-* '*jeſty of a King*;' and ſo the King's ſtyle has remained ever ſince. Thus it is plain that all the inhabitants of

Ireland, whether aboriginals, or of Engliſh race, deſcended from anceſtors who from time to time, ſince that kingdom was annexed to the Engliſh Crown, ſettled in Ireland, are equally the King's ſubjects, and equally entitled to every benefit of the Britiſh Conſtitution, except ſuch of them as render themſelves liable to particular reſtraints, by profeſſing doctrines inimical to the State.

Mr. Molyneux, in his celebrated '*State of Ireland*,' has the following obſervation on this abſurd poſition, that Ireland is to be conſidered as a Britiſh Colony: 'The laſt thing I ſhall take notice of, that ſome raiſe 'againſt us, is, that Ireland is to be looked upon only 'as a colony from England; and therefore as the Roman 'colonies were ſubject to and bound by the laws made 'by the Senate at Rome, ſo ought Ireland by thoſe made 'by the great Council at Weſtminſter. Of all the ob'jections raiſed againſt us, I take this to be the moſt ex'travagant: it ſeems not to have the leaſt foundation or 'colour from reaſon or record. Does it not manifeſtly 'appear by the Conſtitution of Ireland, that it is a com'plete kingdom within itſelf? Do not the Kings of 'England bear the ſtyle of Ireland amongſt the reſt of 'their kingdoms? Is this agreeable to the nature of 'a colony? Do they uſe the title of Kings of Virginia, 'New England, or Maryland? Was not Ireland given 'by Henry the Second, in a Parliament at Oxford, to 'his ſon John, and made thereby an abſolute kingdom, 'ſeparate and wholly independent on England, till they 'both came united again in him, after the death of his 'brother Richard without iſſue? Have not multitudes 'of Acts of Parliament, both in England and Ireland,

' declared Ireland a complete kingdom? Is not Ireland ' ſtyled in them all, the Kingdom or Realm of Ireland? ' Do theſe names agree to a colony? Have we not a ' Parliament and Courts of Judicature? Do theſe things ' agree with a colony? This, on all hands, involves ſo ' many abſurdities, that I think it deſerves nothing more ' of our conſideration.' See Molyneux's State of Ireland, printed by Long, Dublin, 1749. P. 52, 53.

Since I have quoted this celebrated tract, I hope I ſhall be excuſed for a ſhort digreſſion here, to ſhow by another quotation from it, that Mr. Molyneux, the famous champion for the independence of the Iriſh Legiſlature on that of England, was notwithſtanding a firm friend to an Incorporating Union of the two Kingdoms. In page 37 he has the following paſſage, which is fraudulently omitted in a ſubſequent edition printed in 1782: ' If, from theſe laſt-mentioned records, it be concluded ' that the Parliament of England may bind Ireland, it ' muſt alſo be allowed that the people of Ireland ought ' to have their Repreſentatives in the Parliament of Eng- ' land; and this I believe we would be willing enough ' to embrace, *but this is a happineſs we can hardly hope for.*' How ſmall the hopes of the Iriſh nation at the time Mr. Molyneux wrote, were, of their being admitted to the benefits clearly reſulting from an Incorporating Union, may be conjectured from what happened ſoon after the acceſſion of Queen Anne. The Iriſh Houſe of Peers at that time petitioned the Crown to promote ſuch an Incorporating Union; but the Engliſh Miniſters ſcornfully rejected the application. Thank Heaven! ſound ſenſe and reaſon have ſince triumphed over ſuch abſurd prejudices.

To return from my digreſſion. I truſt I have clearly proved, that the Iriſh nation neither is, nor can be conſidered as, a Britiſh colony; and I have before, in accounting for the ſanguinary diſpoſition of Iriſh Romaniſts to their Proteſtant fellow-ſubjects, ſhown, that no ſuch diſtinction as that of Native and Coloniſt does or can ſubſiſt between the preſent inhabitants of Ireland; and that the only general diſtinction between them is, that of Proteſtant and Romaniſt,—a diſtinction, which I hope will be extinguiſhed only by the converſion of ſo large a portion of our population to the Proteſtant Faith. I ſhall therefore, in the following remarks on this abominable libel, and in extracting and expelling the virus of it, ſubſtitute the words *Proteſtant* and *Romaniſt* for the words *Coloniſt* and *Native*.

The Author, in the firſt place, ſtates, that the Iriſh Proteſtants, when compared with the Romaniſts, are but a handful. I have already expoſed the falſity of this ſtatement, both as to number and property. (See Appendix, No. 1.) He aſſerts that the Iriſh Parliament (called by him ſneeringly the Parliament of Dublin) is not the Repreſentative of the Nation, but of this handful of Proteſtants. Iriſh Romaniſts were enabled, by the Act of 1793, already mentioned, to vote at the elections of Members of Parliament, and were admitted to the exerciſe of that franchiſe at the election of the preſent Iriſh Commons. By the Britiſh Conſtitution, the election of the Commons is made by the people in proportion to their property, not their numbers. I have already ſhown, that of the property of the nation, thirty-nine parts out of forty are in the hands of Iriſh Proteſtants; ſo that if the Act of 1793 had not paſſed, and if the

preſent

preſent Commons had been elected by the Proteſtants alone, it would be a falſehood to ſtate, that they were not the legitimate Repreſentatives of the People: they would be the Repreſentatives of thirty-nine parts out of forty of the People, reckoned by their property; the remaining fortieth part of the property being in the hands of perſons diſqualified from voting by the laws of the Society, founded in wiſdom and juſtice. But even that fortieth part voted on the election of the preſent Repreſentatives. In fact, the Commons of Ireland are elected by a much greater proportion of the property of the Iriſh nation, than the Commons of Great Britain by that of the property of the Britiſh nation, the relative wealth and population of the two nations duly conſidered; ſo that this Author's aſſertion, that the preſent Iriſh Commons are not the Repreſentatives of the Nation in general, but of a handful of Proteſtants, is as falſe as moſt of his other aſſertions.

Further to diſgrace and vilify the Iriſh Parliament, and to excite and provoke Iriſh Romaniſts to rebellion and murder, and with no other poſſible deſign, he ſtates, *that the Iriſh Houſe of Commons is elected by Engliſhmen, and compoſed of Engliſhmen, to the excluſion of the ancient occupants of the ſoil.* Here, notwithſtanding his flimſy diſguiſe, the whole traitorous Iriſh Romaniſt burſts forth in full deformity! It can hardly be alledged that ſuch an aſſertion was intended to provoke the enmity of the Engliſh Nation againſt the Iriſh Parliament. No, no: it is the true genuine ſentiment of all Iriſh Romaniſts, who call all Proteſtants in their language *Saſonaghs*, that is, Engliſhmen: the Iriſh Parliament are *Proteſtants*, and therefore, in their vocabulary, *Engliſhmen.* It is the

Romiſh

Romiſh war-whoop in Ireland againſt their Proteſtant countrymen: it marks them out for ſlaughter, as the cry of Mad dog! is the ſignal for the deſtruction of the canine ſpecies. It is the very ſame ſentiment contained in the Letter of Theobald Wolfe Tone, Founder of the Society of United Iriſhmen, and the celebrated Agent of the Iriſh Romaniſts, to his aſſociated Conſpirators in Belfaſt, in the year 1791. It is as follows: 'We have no national Government: *we are ruled by Engliſhmen, and the 'ſervants of Engliſhmen*, filled, as to commerce and politics, with the ſhort-ſighted and ignorant prejudices of 'their country.' (See Appendix, No. 2, to the Report of the Secret Committee of the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, 1798.)

This abuſe and degradation of the Iriſh Parliament militate directly againſt the pretended ſcope of the pamphlet, which is, to induce the Iriſh nation to agree to an Incorporating Union with Great Britain, and which can be accompliſhed in a lawful peaceable way, not otherwiſe than by the concurrence of the Parliaments of the two countries in the meaſure; and this Writer not only inſinuates, but openly aſſerts and proclaims, that the Iriſh Parliament is not the Repreſentative of the Iriſh Nation, that is, is not a Parliament, and is therefore incompetent to contract or agree for the Iriſh Nation. Here then his maſk falls entirely off, and his true purpoſe appears, which is, to inflame the Iriſh Romaniſts to riſe up againſt and deſtroy a band of Engliſh Uſurpers, pretending to be their Repreſentatives, and actually aſſuming the government of the country. He calls this band, in many places, Robbers and Plunderers; and tells the Iriſh Romaniſts, that the weakneſs of this band makes them jealous

jealous and afraid of them; and that they cannot expect to be emancipated or truſted by ſuch Uſurpers, whoſe force they deſpiſe; and that the Iriſh Proteſtants have a trembling dependance on Great Britain for a daily and precarious exiſtence.

In the next place, he takes care to inculcate the doctrine of the baſeneſs and corruption of this band of Engliſh Uſurpers, the Iriſh Commons: he ſtates, with his accuſtomed diſregard, and even contempt of truth, that out of the whole number, being three hundred, there are one hundred and ſixteen Placemen, and ſeventy Aſpirants of the Law. The number of practiſing Barriſters in the Houſe of Commons does not amount to more than thirty-five, including all the Law Officers of the Crown, and many of theſe are Placemen; and there are not more Placemen, in proportion to their numbers, in the Iriſh Houſe of Commons than in the Britiſh. In my 'Anſwer 'to Mr. Grattan's Addreſs to the Citizens of Dublin,' I have fully diſcuſſed the queſtion, whether the conferring places of truſt and emolument on Members of the Houſe of Commons by the Crown, be an improper on unconſtitutional exerciſe of the prerogative; and I truſt I have proved that it is not: for I have ſhown, firſt, that the Crown cannot ſelect perſons to fill places of truſt out of any other body with ſo much propriety; nay more, that the Crown is under the neceſſity of employing Members of the Houſe of Commons as its ſervants, in executing the public buſineſs of the nation, in preference to the members of any other body: and, in the next place, I have ſhown, that the influence of the Crown in the Houſe of Commons, derived from the patronage of ſuch places, is a conſtitutional influence; that the frame of

our

our Government could not ſubſiſt without it; and that, in many caſes of political economy, theory muſt bend a little to practice. But it is worth obſerving, how inconſiſtent this Author's accuſation of corruption againſt the Iriſh Houſe of Commons is, with that part of its conduct which he pretends has raiſed all his indignation againſt it; that is, its rejection of the propoſal on the part of Great Britain of an Incorporating Union of the two nations, notwithſtanding this propoſal was ſupported in the Iriſh Houſe of Commons by the whole weight and influence of the Adminiſtration, and by ſeveral honeſt and able Senators, who were not Placemen; yet it was rejected. It was ſupported by one hundred and eight Members only. What became then of the one hundred and ſixteen Placemen? It is plain that the alledged corruption of the Members of that Houſe, by the diſpoſition of places among them, had not the effect of warping them to vote contrary to their opinions. In truth, the meaſure was too precipitately urged; due time was not afforded for the cool and ſerious conſideration of the great and ſubſtantial merit of ſo important a project; it was very improvidently ſought to be carried by a coup de main: but I truſt and firmly expect that the meaſure will meet with a very different reception in the enſuing ſeſſion; and that time and reflection, and the good ſenſe of the Commons, though indignant at the unjuſt accuſation of corruption, will enſure its ſucceſs.

The author's next abuſe of the Iriſh Proteſtants, as grantees of Cromwell and William the Third, as the children of their ſoldiers and the heirs of their rapacity, again betrays the Iriſh Romaniſt, whoſe heart is goaded by the œſtrum of revenge. As the firſt effuſion of his

rancour,

rancour, he places our illuſtrious Deliverer, in part the Founder, or at leaſt the Reſtorer, of our preſent glorious Conſtitution, in the ſame rank with the deſperate Regicide. Next he vents his abuſe on all Iriſh Proteſtants, ſtating them to be the children of the ſoldiers of theſe two Commanders, and the heirs of their rapacity. He reprobates all the forfeitures and confiſcations of the Iriſh Traitors, which took place after the ſuppreſſion of two Iriſh Rebellions; the one in the reign of King Charles the Firſt, the other in that of William and Mary. Theſe forfeitures and confiſcations are the conſtant themes of abuſive Romiſh declamation in Ireland. The whole party load the memory of Cromwell, as well as of King William, with every ſpecies of vituperation: this ſnarling cur, therefore, only runs on the trail of his growling precurſors, and joins in the conſtant cry of his own pack, when he opens againſt the Regicide and the Monarch; but it is not improper to examine the grounds of his acrimonious complaints.

The Engliſh Monarchs, ſucceſſors of Henry the Second, inherited great dominions in France. The maintenance of their power on the continent engroſſed their attention, drained their treaſures, and found conſtant employment for their armies. Hence the Government of Ireland, till the reign of Elizabeth, was much neglected. The Iriſh natives, ſcared at the dawn of civilization, preferred the gloom of their own foreſts and moraſſes to the ſunſhine of cultivation and improvement. The great Engliſh Lords, who became entitled to vaſt tracts of land in Ireland, ſuch as the Earl of Chepſtow, otherwiſe Strongbow, who, by marriage with the only daughter and child of the provincial

vincial King of Leinſter, acquired vaſt poſſeſſions in that province, did not take the proper care to improve the country. They brought over with them to Ireland many of their friends and vaſſals: they by degrees mixed with the native Iriſh, and adopted their barbarous cuſtoms. When the great civil war broke out in England between the Houſes of York and Lancaſter, moſt of the chiefs of the great Engliſh families in Ireland joined the contending parties, and went over to England with their vaſſals and retainers. The barbarous Iriſh joined the degenerate Engliſh mixed with them, took the advantage of the weakneſs of the Government, the natural effect of the migration of its ſupporters: they rebelled, and ſeized on nearly three fourths of the kingdom, which continued in a lawleſs barbarous ſtate till the acceſſion of Queen Elizabeth. That great Princeſs, after a long and expenſive war, reduced to obedience all the Iriſh Rebels, but died before ſhe could reap the harveſt of her victories. Her ſucceſſor, James the Firſt, laboured with great activity and zeal on the ſettlement and civilization of the whole kingdom. He divided the lands forfeited by Rebellion, in ſome places into three parts; two of which parts he diſtributed among the ancient poſſeſſors, whether native Iriſh or degenerate Engliſh; the remaining third he beſtowed on new ſettlers from Scotland and England. In other places, he diſtributed half of theſe lands to the old poſſeſſors, the other half to new ſettlers. He divided ſuch parts of the kingdom as had, in the manner before mentioned, been ſeized on and occupied by the natives and degenerate Engliſh, into counties. In theſe new, or rather revived counties, he erected towns and created boroughs: he inſtituted a regular Parliament, the Members of the Houſe of Commons of which were elected by

by the old poſſeſſors and the new ſettlers without diſtinction, in proportion to their properties, throughout the whole nation. Romaniſts and Proteſtants ſat indiſcriminately in the Houſes of Lords and Commons. None were excluded by any Teſt Oaths whatſoever: the only oath required was the Oath of Allegiance. Every meaſure which human wiſdom could deviſe was purſued, as well in the reign of James as in that of his ſucceſſor Charles, to civilize and improve the country. The inhabitants, without diſtinction, were invited to all the comforts and all the benefits of civilization and a well-regulated Government. The nation aſſumed a different appearance from that it had worn for a ſeries of ages; and a complete fuſion of all deſcriptions of Iriſh inhabitants would have been then effected with rapidity, were it not for the unhappy differences on the ſcore of Religion. The intolerant, unſocial doctrines of Popery, irreconcilable to the Proteſtant inſtitutions, had taken deep root in the minds of the majority of the inhabitants; and from thence ſprung the moſt barbarous and moſt unprovoked Rebellion of Iriſh Romaniſts recorded in hiſtory. This Rebellion, which broke out in the year 1641, cannot be palliated, as an Inſurrection of oppreſſed Natives againſt uſurping Coloniſts: for the beſt diſciplined, beſt provided, and moſt numerous army of the Inſurgents, was compoſed of the inhabitants of the Engliſh Pale; a part of Ireland which was peopled by Engliſh ſettlers, who for ages before had continued faithful to the Engliſh Crown, and till that period had never intermixed by marriage, or any ſort of connexion, with the native Iriſh. It was commanded by General Preſton, brother of the then Lord Gormanſtown. It was an avowed Rebellion of Iriſh Romaniſts, undertaken

by

by them for the purpoſe of extirpating Iriſh Proteſtants of all deſcriptions, and ſevering themſelves from England, at that time diſtracted by civil commotions. The Rebels in Munſter were commanded by Lord Mountgarret, and other Noblemen and Gentlemen, all, or moſt of them, of the old Engliſh race. During the firſt year of this Rebellion, the Rebels murdered, at the loweſt calculation, near forty thouſand Iriſh Proteſtants, men, women, and children, in cold blood: many of them they put to death by the moſt excruciating tortures. Such of the Proteſtants as eſcaped from the firſt exploſion of the Rebellion, which burſt ſuddenly and unexpectedly like a thunder-ſtorm on their heads, flew to arms; and for a ſpace of ten years and upwards, with very little aſſiſtance from England, maintained a cruel and deſtructive, though unequal war, with the Rebels, and protected the ſurviving Loyalty of the nation, as well from the Republican Fanatics of that age, as from theſe Romiſh Traitors, who frequently, in the courſe of the Rebellion, joined the Republicans, and invariably adopted ſuch meaſures as they thought would moſt conduce to their ends,—the Eſtabliſhment of Popery, the Extirpation of Proteſtants, and the Separation of Ireland from the Britiſh Crown. At one period of this Rebellion, the chief Traitors propoſed a treaty with the then Marquis, afterwards Duke of Ormond, the King's Lieutenant in Ireland; to which propoſal he was obliged, by the neceſſity of His Majeſty's affairs, to accede. The treaty was concluded, and the Marquis, with a part of the Royal Army, was inveigled by the Rebels to Kilkenny, the place of meeting of what they ſtyled the General Aſſembly of the Catholics of Ireland, much of the ſame nature with the late Romiſh Convention which aſſembled

in Dublin. The Rebels moſt perfidiouſly, at the inſtance of the Pope's Nuncio, broke the treaty; and two of their armies, commanded by Generals Preſton and O'Neil, marched to ſurpriſe the Marquis, to intercept him in his retreat to Dublin, and to cut off his troops. They were very near ſucceeding in their enterpriſe, the Marquis eſcaping with great difficulty. In ſhort, they contributed full as much as the Scotch Covenanters, to the final ſucceſs of the Republicans in England, and the ſubverſion of the Monarchy. But the Almighty ſaw their wickedneſs and perfidy, and puniſhed them by the hands of their own aſſociates in rebellion and murder. The Engliſh Republicans, having made themſelves maſters of England, ſent over an army under Cromwell to reduce them to obedience, not to their lawful Sovereign, but to the newly-erected Engliſh Republic; and to revenge the blood of the Proteſtants of Ireland ſo inhumanly ſpilled by them. In one ſhort campaign he completely routed and diſperſed their murdering, daſtardly bands. Such of them as eſcaped the ſword, he drove out of the nation or hanged, parcelled out their landed property, juſtly forfeited by their Rebellion, among the ſurviving Iriſh Proteſtants, who had been robbed by them; his own officers and ſoldiers, in lieu of their pay; and men who had ſubſcribed large ſums of money to defray the expenſes of his expedition, who were ſtyled Adventurers. On the reſtoration of Monarchy, this diviſion of the lands ſo juſtly forfeited to the Crown was reviſed, and its juſtice and propriety ſtrictly examined and inquired into, by Commiſſioners duly appointed for that purpoſe. In every caſe in which it appeared that the lands of an innocent perſon were comprized in the diviſion, they were reſtored to him or his heir; and the

perſon in conſequence diſpoſſeſſed was awarded a compenſation, called a Repriſal; and the titles of all to the lands juſtly forfeited were eſtabliſhed and confirmed by two Acts of the Iriſh Parliament, entitled, the Acts of Settlement and Explanation.

The complaint of this Romiſh Writer of the confiſcations by King William is ſtill more unjuſt. The Iriſh Romaniſts, after the acceſſion of William and Mary, roſe in rebellion in a maſs. Their views were the very ſame as in the Rebellion of 1641,—the eſtabliſhment of Popery, and Separation from England. Their apparent attachment to King James the Second aroſe from intereſted views: they hoped by his means to procure powerful aſſiſtance from the Court of France, and they conſidered him only as an engine auxiliary to their real deſigns. When that Rebellion was finally ſuppreſſed by the ſurrender of Limerick in the year 1691, one of the conditions ſtipulated on behalf of the Romaniſts was, that ſuch of them as choſe to remain in their own country, rather than repair to France and enter into the ſervice of that hoſtile nation, ſhould, on their taking the Oath of Allegiance to King William and Queen Mary, preſerve their eſtates diſcharged of forfeiture and confiſcation on account of their rebellion. A few of them choſe to ſtay at home, and they preſerved their eſtates: the reſt went to France, and thereby voluntarily ſubmitted their eſtates to forfeiture; which eſtates were afterwards partly ſold for the public benefit, and partly granted by the Crown to perſons who had loyally ſerved it in ſuch critical times. The complaints, therefore, of this Romiſh Writer, of the forfeitures and confiſcations in the times of Cromwell and King William, amount to this;

this; that the confiſcation and forfeiture of the property of Rebels, the moſt ſanguinary and barbarous whoſe crimes ever blotted and defaced the page of hiſtory, are unjuſt; amount to robbery and plunder, exerciſed by rapacious uſurpers, though warranted by the known law of the land in all ages; and conſequently that the law of the land warrants and patronizes robbery, plunder, and rapacity; and that all loyal ſubjects are robbers and plunderers. And in conformity with this doctrine, he proceeds to reprobate all puniſhment of the late Iriſh Rebels by confiſcation and forfeiture.

This Romiſh Writer aſſerts, that Iriſh Proteſtants have a trembling dependance on the Engliſh nation for their exiſtence; and dwells on their weakneſs, timidity, and cruelty, and on the irreſiſtible ſtrength, numbers, and courage of the preſent race of Iriſh Romaniſts, with exultation and delight; intimating, that if the Engliſh nation will remain neuter, the Iriſh Romaniſts will inſtantly extirpate the Iriſh Proteſtants, who at preſent, by the aid of England, keep them in *chains*. It is therefore proper to examine whether Iriſh Romaniſts be in a ſtate of oppreſſion and ſlavery, and kept in *chains* by their Proteſtant countrymen. By the laws of Ireland at preſent, the Romaniſts enjoy more real political liberty, and better ſecurity for their lives and properties, than the moſt favoured ſubjects of any foreign State in the known world. They elect their Repreſentatives in Parliament; in which Parliament, together with the King, the ſupreme authority of the State is veſted; they have the benefit of a conſtitutional Jury to try all queſtions which affect their lives or properties; they enjoy the benefit of the Habeas Corpus Act as much as Proteſtants; they

have a ſhare in the Magiſtracy; they are Grand Jurors; they can acquire and diſpoſe of their properties, real and perſonal, as freely as Proteſtants; they enjoy a complete toleration in Religion; the Law and the Army are open to them; and they are on a perfect equality with all His Majeſty's other ſubjects, except that their own refuſal to take the Teſt Oaths excludes them from ſeats in Parliament, and from about thirty of the great offices of the State. (See all the preſent incapacities of Iriſh Romaniſts, particularly ſpecified in the 9th ſection of the Act of the 33d year of His preſent Majeſty, entitled, 'An Act for the Relief of His Majeſty's Popiſh 'or Roman Catholic Subjects of Ireland.' Appendix, No. 2.) Such are the chains and fetters in which their Proteſtant countrymen bind Iriſh Romaniſts! and ſuch is the ſlavery ſo pathetically deplored by this Writer, and others of his perſuaſion!

The ſtrength and puiſſance of Iriſh Romaniſts have been put to the trial in their late Rebellion. They were vanquiſhed and completely ſubdued by the Proteſtant power of the nation, without any aſſiſtance from England, in the courſe of about ſix weeks. The Marquis Cornwallis, as before obſerved, had no part of the merit of quelling the Rebellion: it was effectually cruſhed by the meaſures taken by his predeceſſor, before he had time in any manner to interfere. It is true, ſome part of the routed Rebels took ſhelter, after his arrival in Ireland, in the mountains of Wicklow, and from thence made incurſions, in detached gangs of banditti, into the counties of Kildare and Meath; but they were hunted like wild beaſts by the Proteſtant Yeomanry, and would have been all ſlain or hanged, were it not for the merciful

interpoſition of the Marquis. Immediately after his arrival in Ireland, he publiſhed a Proclamation of Indemnity to ſuch of theſe Rebels as would ſubmit, and ſurrender their arms. His Generals reſtrained the efforts of the Yeomanry, incenſed againſt the Rebels for the ſlaughter of their relations and friends, and the waſte of their property. At the time this Proclamation was iſſued, the Rebellion, as to any effects to be dreaded from it of important damage to the nation in general, was cruſhed; and the routed Traitors, hopeleſs, without reſource or means of efficient reſiſtance, juſtly expected the puniſhment due to their horrible crimes; which the Marquis, following the dictates (as I ſuppoſe) of his own clemency, or perhaps by orders from England, remitted.

Two of his Generals were employed to ſuppreſs the only conſiderable body of this ſcattered Banditti, which remained together in the mountains of Wicklow: they were moſtly Murderers, Robbers, and Deſperadoes, hopeleſs of pardon; ſome of them Deſerters from different Regiments of Militia. A Gentleman of the county conducted theſe Generals and their forces to a certain part of the mountains, the rendezvous of theſe aſſaſſins, where they might have deſtroyed the whole gang, amounting to about ſix hundred; but theſe Commanders declined to attack them, declaring they were unwilling to ſhed the blood of *the poor wretches*. They therefore thought it prudent to coax them into ſubmiſſion; for which purpoſe they diſpatched two Romiſh Prieſts to them, loaded with the Proclamations of Indemnity; they collected as many country Girls as they could procure; they hired a number of Iriſh Pipers; they provided hogſheads of whiſkey, ſet the Pipers playing, and

the Girls dancing, which ſo delighted the Murderers, that many of them came in, gave up their pikes, partook of the feſtivity, and departed with plenty of whiſkey in their ſtomachs, and protections in their pockets. The clemency of the Marquis and his Generals was celebrated in all the Romiſh Newſpapers of the city of Dublin; his praiſes were wafted to London; the Courier, the Morning Chronicle, &c. re-echoed them; the whole Oppoſition in England from top to bottom,

From ſlaſhing Bentleys down to piddling Tibbalds,

rung the changes on his liberality, his mercy, his clemency, his wiſdom, &c.: and well they might; for the Marquis arrived in Ireland in the very nick of time, to reſcue their party there from final extinction. In ſhort, in reſpect to the Iriſh Rebels, the conduct of the Marquis has been marked with conceſſion, conciliation, and pardon, not with warlike hoſtility; for expiring Rebellion did not demand the exertion of his military talents, and he diſdained to trample upon proſtrate Traitors. It is my fervent wiſh, my conſtant prayer, that the mercy thus extended to theſe Romiſh Inſurgents may incline their hearts to peace and loyalty, and make them underſtand, that they live under and are protected by a Government the mildeſt upon earth, which wiſhes not to inflict the puniſhments due to their crimes, but rather that they ſhould repent, and enjoy the comforts of peace and ſecurity under the protection of laws, to which all the members of the community are equally ſubject.

The Marquis Cornwallis certainly merits the tribute of juſt praiſe from all the loyal ſubjects of His Majeſty in Ireland, for the powerful exertions of his military

ſkill,

ſkill, in putting the kingdom into the moſt complete ſtate of defence againſt the invaſion of the foreign enemy, with which it is threatened. Every branch of military ſervice has been attended to by him with the utmoſt care and zeal: the troops have been ſtationed ſo judiciouſly in cantonments, that a ſtrong body can be aſſembled with great expedition in any part of the kingdom, againſt which the Enemy may point his attack; the Cavalry, Infantry, and Artillery, Regulars and Militia, are perfectly well equipped and provided, and the Yeomanry well armed and trained, and ready for action at the ſhorteſt notice; the whole nation wears a military aſpect, and its force is ſo combined and regulated by the ſkilful arrangements of the Marquis, that it may bid defiance to an infinitely more formidable force than its foreign enemies are able to bring againſt it; and internal tranquillity is re-eſtabliſhed, *at leaſt for the preſent.*

The weakneſs and timidity of the Iriſh Proteſtants are the next themes of this Romiſh Declaimer; according to him, their weakneſs makes them timid, their timidity cruel. Of the vaunts of the ſtrength, numbers, and wealth of Iriſh Romaniſts I have already expoſed the falſity; as well by the event of the late Rebellion, as by a fair calculation of their real numbers and wealth. The ſame arguments and calculation prove the real ſtrength, numbers, and wealth of Iriſh Proteſtants. I truſt that in the late Rebellion, as well as on all former occaſions, Iriſh Proteſtants have plainly diſproved the charge of timidity. The cruelty this Author charges upon them, is, that they cruelly refuſed to grant, what he calls Emancipation, to their Romiſh fellow-ſubjects: that is, it is

a great cruelty in Iriſh Proteſtants to refuſe to deliver the Sovereignty of the State into the hands of Iriſh Romaniſts; and this cruelty ariſes from cowardice; for Iriſh Proteſtants are afraid to do ſo. If ſuch be cruelty and cowardice, I hope ſuch will for ever be imputable to Iriſh Proteſtants: may they always be afraid to deliver the State into the power of its enemies! and may they always cruelly refuſe to betray the Conſtitution! it is the ſame cruelty and cowardice a man is guilty of, who tells a gang of robbers, 'Do not attempt to come 'into my houſe, for if you make ſuch attempt, I and 'my ſervants will reſiſt, and perhaps kill you; I will 'not truſt you in my houſe, keep at the outſide.' Such a man certainly is afraid to let them into his houſe, and threatens to kill them if they attempt to force an entrance: is he therefore guilty of cowardice and cruelty?

But one argument remains, demonſtrative of the real ſtrength of Iriſh Proteſtants: they have raiſed during this war, in which their connexion with Great Britain has involved them, immenſe ſums for the ſervice of the Empire in general, and for the proſecution of the war. That Iriſh Parliament, which this Writer vilifies and traduces, as the Repreſentatives of a handful of Proteſtants and Engliſhmen, has raiſed in this year ſeven millions ſterling for the public ſervice, though the nation was in that year weakened by the Rebellion of Iriſh Romaniſts; of which great ſum one part out of forty only was, or could be paid by Iriſh Romaniſts: ſome part of that money, it is true, has been borrowed in England, but on the credit and ſecurity of the Iriſh Funds; both principal and intereſt are to be paid by Ireland. All the Engliſh Militia, who, on the breaking

out

out of the Rebellion, ſo gallantly volunteered for the aſſiſtance of their brethren the Proteſtants of Ireland, as well againſt their foreign as domeſtic enemies, were paid, after they arrived in Ireland, out of the Iriſh Treaſury and Iriſh Funds. Are the Iriſh Proteſtants then ſo weak, as to be the objects of deriſion and contempt to this Romiſh Writer and his aſſociates? And is Ireland only *a diverſion of the power and force, an arſenal of attack and injury, and a devouring gulf of the blood and reſources of England in the preſent war*, as this Romiſh Writer aſſerts? The revenues of Pruſſia, one of the moſt potent European States, do not amount yearly to ſix millions ſterling. Ireland, by the efforts of her Proteſtant Parliament and population, has contributed ſeven millions in the laſt year, and in the preceding year, five millions, to the ſupport of the war, and has not coſt Great Britain a ſixpence for her defence. It is true the Britiſh Fleet and Britiſh Militia have flown to her ſupport, when threatened with invaſion by the common enemy: but Ireland has paid the Britiſh Militia for their aſſiſtance. And has not Great Britain employed her fleets and armies for the ſupport of her allies in the preſent war, and even paid the troops of her allies for fighting in their own defence? And is ſhe not bound to give greater aſſiſtance to Ireland, a part of the Britiſh Empire, to defend her againſt the common enemy, than to foreign nations her allies? This Writer ſays, *it would be better for Great Britain, that Ireland were blotted from the liſt of nations, and ſunk in the ſea, than that ſhe ſhould remain a diverſion of her arms in the preſent war.* May not the ſame be ſaid with equal juſtice of any part of Great Britain itſelf, if threatened with an attack by the enemy; of Yorkſhire, of Scotland, for inſtance?

inſtance? Ireland is in fact as much a part of the Britiſh European Empire, as either of the countries mentioned, and her ſubjugation by the enemy would be as injurious to that Empire, and ſo would her loſs, by immerſion in the ocean.

The complaints of this Libeller, of a criminal neglect of the natives of Ireland by the Engliſh nation, and that the barbarity of theſe natives is juſtly to be attributed to this neglect, are utterly unfounded: ever ſince the commencement of the reign of James the Firſt, as long as the diſtinction of Native and Coloniſt, or rather New Settler, remained among the inhabitants of Ireland, the attention of the Engliſh Monarchs, and their Miniſters in Ireland, was uniformly directed to the encouragement and civilization of the natives; and to the abolition of all diſtinctions between the inhabitants of the country. Their benevolent intentions have been counteracted only, by the intolerant ſpirit of Popery, inceſſantly operating as an effectual barrier againſt harmony and union, as I have already proved.

This Author's praiſes of the Romiſh titular Biſhops in Ireland, of *their learning, humanity, and piety;* of all which accompliſhments, I preſume he means to offer Huſſey, the titular Biſhop of Waterford, as a ſhining example; his advice to them, *to unfurl their Sacred Banners;* his ſuggeſtion of the doctrine of *Impreſcriptibility*, of which he hints a feeble diſapprobation only, according to which Iriſh Romaniſts, or, as he calls them, Natives, *have a right to the poſſeſſion of all the lands of the nation, which no time, no length of poſſeſſion can alienate;* and his frequent introduction of the eternal principles

of

of *revenge* of the Iriſh Romaniſts againſt Iriſh Proteſtants; all, all proclaim him an inveterate Iriſh Romaniſt; and his folly as well as impudence in attempting to aſſume the maſk of an Engliſhman.

I ſhall now cloſe my obſervations on this anonymous ſlanderer and his libel, with the ſum of his arguments, to induce the inhabitants of Ireland to conſent to an Union with Great Britain; from which it will clearly appear, that his real deſign was directly contrary to his profeſſed one; and was to promote the ſeparation of Ireland from Great Britain, by ſtimulating the Iriſh Romaniſts to a Rebellion; and by ſowing the ſeeds of diſſenſion between the Engliſh and Iriſh Proteſtants; and thereby depriving the latter of all aſſiſtance from Great Britain, if not enſuring its hoſtility againſt them.

His argument to the Iriſh Proteſtants to induce them to conſent to an Union, is as follows: 'You, the Iriſh 'Proteſtants, are the baſeſt, moſt tyrannical, moſt 'cowardly, moſt cruel race of mortals on the earth; 'you are as weak as you are cowardly: we, the Engliſh 'Proteſtants, conſider you in this light; we deteſt your 'crimes; you are murderers and robbers, you cannot 'exiſt but by our favour and protection. Give your-'ſelves up directly into our hands without reſerve; if 'you do not, the deſcendants of thoſe you have mur-'dered and robbed will quickly deſtroy you: notwith-'ſtanding you are ſo infamous a race, and that we have 'ſo thorough a contempt for you, we will confer on 'you a perfect equality with ourſelves; and we, the 'braveſt, the richeſt, and the moſt honourable people 'on the earth, will aſſociate with you on perfect terms

'of

' of equality. Robbers, murderers, and daſtardly ' wretches as you are, you ſhall become our companions ' and our friends; we will treat you exactly as brethren; ' you ſhall ſhare all our advantages and all our fortunes. In ſhort, the means by which he propoſes to reconcile Iriſh Proteſtants to an Union with Great Britain, are, in the character of an Engliſhman, to load them with ' very ſpecies of abuſe, ſlander, and calumny, and brand them with every crime which can debaſe humanity. Very conciliating means truly!

His arguments to induce Iriſh Romaniſts to agree to an Union with Great Britain are: ' You, the natives of ' Ireland, have been baſely and wickedly tyrannized over ' by the Engliſh nation for ſix centuries paſt, as your ' confidential agent Mr. Tone has already told you. The ' Engliſh have robbed you of your lands, they have reduced ' you to a ſtate of barbarous ſlavery: they govern you at ' preſent by a gang of corrupt ſub-tyrants, whom they ſtyle ' a Parliament, *elected by Engliſhmen, and compoſed of Engliſhmen, to the excluſion of you the ancient occupants of the ſoil*: ' theſe ſub-tyrants are the Repreſentatives of a handful ' only of Engliſhmen, their fellow-tyrants in your coun- ' try of Ireland: you are fully able to deſtroy them, for ' they are weak and timid. You are juſtly entitled to all ' the lands now poſſeſſed by them, *for no length of time can* ' *warrant their retention of them.* You have endured *ſix* ' *centuries of calamity, of fruitleſs ſtruggles and tenacious op-* ' *preſſion.* Great Britain, employed fully in the preſent ' war with France, is unable to protect her *colony of mur-* ' *derers and robbers.* Now is your time for ſhaking off the ' Engliſh yoke. You have *revenge* to gratify, and the ' *recovery of your property* will be your reward: the de-

' ſtruction

'ſtruction of the Engliſh invaders will be the certain conſequence of your attempt to ſhake off your *chains. I lately heard a propoſal made in the Britiſh Parliament utterly to extirpate you! not to leave a Rohilla (that is, a Tribe) of you living!* The Engliſh are Heretics, with whom it would be impious for you, by the principles of your holy Religion, to aſſociate, or fraternize. Your Biſhops are men of the greateſt piety, humanity, and learning, particularly the *Right Reverend Father Huſſey*, your Biſhop of Waterford: you have all read his pious Paſtoral Letter, fully ſtating *your oppreſſion by a handful of Heretics, not a tenth, nay not an hundredth part of you in number.* Unfurl your ſacred banners, as your brethren the late ſuppreſſed Iriſh martyrs did; they marched under ſacred green banners, with a white croſs and reverſed crown floating in the midſt: you ought to have all joined in that holy war, though you did not, from an ill-grounded timidity; conſequently the Heretics were victorious. Yet I adviſe you to forget your *revenge*, to abandon all thoughts of *recovering your lands*, and to give yourſelves up into the hands of the *Engliſh Heretics* by agreeing to an Incorporating Union with Great Britain!'

How far ſuch arguments are likely to ſucceed with Iriſh Romaniſts in promoting an Union; and how far the Author intended they ſhould ſucceed, I leave to the judgment of the reader.

I ſhall now proceed, purſuant to my original purpoſe, to make a few ſhort remarks on ſome pamphlets which have been publiſhed in England, on the ſubject of an Incorporating Union, as the ſubſtance of Speeches made in

in both Houſes of the Britiſh Parliament, by men of great rank, and in high offices in Britain. My remarks ſhall be confined to ſuch parts of their Speeches, as relate to the two great claſſes of Iriſh population, to wit, thoſe of Proteſtants and Romaniſts.

Obſervations on a pamphlet, entitled, 'The Speech of Lord Minto, in the Houſe of Lords, April 11, 1799.'

I will begin with a pamphlet entitled, '*The Speech of Lord Minto in the Houſe of Lords, April* 11, 1799,' becauſe his Lordſhip has conſumed ſixteen pages, beginning at page 66, and ending with page 82, in arguing for the *right*, as he ſtyles it, *of Iriſh Romaniſts to political equality with Iriſh Proteſtants.* He ſtyles their excluſion from Parliament, and from about thirty of the great offices of the State, ſuch as thoſe of Viceroy, of Lord Chancellor, of Judges, and of General in Chief, &c. *the preſent humiliating and degrading excluſion of the Catholic part of the Iriſh nation;* throughout ſtyling Iriſh Romaniſts, *Catholics*, not Romaniſts, or Roman Catholics, excluding Proteſtants from all title to *Catholicity*, though Chriſtians: he ſtates himſelf to be a *warm* friend to the meaſure of an Union, principally on account of its meliorating the condition, and extinguiſhing the diſcontents of a great majority of the inhabitants of Ireland, *by providing for the juſt claims of the Catholic Iriſh, by an explicit article of the treaty itſelf.* And he ſtates a very curious dilemma, entirely founded on the *aſſumed poſition, that Iriſh Romaniſts have a juſt right to political equality with Proteſtants;* which aſſumption his Lordſhip, who ſeems to be an expert logician, muſt know to be *petitio principii.* The dilemma is thus: 'Proteſtant aſcendancy in Ireland cannot be ſupported without derogating from *what may appear to be* 'a natural right of the Catholic:' (in many other places he poſitively aſſerts it to be his right.) 'Catholics cannot

'not

'not be ſupported in their claim of equality, without 'transferring to them that aſcendancy, which equality of 'rights muſt draw to the larger body; this muſt ex- 'poſe the Proteſtants to danger, who ought to be pro- 'tected: and Ireland in its preſent ſituation will be 'gored by one or other of the horns of this dilemma.' He ſtyles the Iriſh Proteſtant aſcendancy a '*monopoly* op- 'poſed to *common right*, that is, to the right of Ro- 'maniſts to political equality.' His Lordſhip, being aware of His Majeſty's Coronation Oath, and the Treaty of Union between England and Scotland; of both which he was too cautious in direct terms to recommend the violation; expreſſes himſelf thus: 'I do not ſee how 'the *jus tertii*, as it may be called, of England, can 'affect the relative claims of theſe two Iriſh nations '(Proteſtants and Romaniſts), or of theſe two parts of 'the Iriſh nation; and therefore I might have thought 'it difficult to aſſign a ſufficient reaſon, to preclude His 'Majeſty, as ſovereign of Ireland, from concurring 'with his Iriſh Parliament, *or even from exerting, in* '*every lawful way, his legitimate powers, in promoting* '*ſuch meaſures as might be calculated* to place every claſs 'of his Iriſh ſubjects on an equal footing as to civil 'rights, and conſolidate theſe two hoſtile nations into '*one peaceable and united family.*' All this cautious, circumlocutory, wheedling argument is uſed by his Lordſhip, to inſinuate, that England has no intereſt in ſupporting the Iriſh Proteſtants; and that the Coronation Oath, and the Treaty of Union between England and Scotland, ought not to preclude the adoption of meaſures tending to the ſubverſion of the preſent Proteſtant eſtabliſhment in Ireland. His Lordſhip propoſes two methods of effecting this: one through the medium of the Iriſh Parliament;

liament; the other, *through that of the King's prerogative*: and I wiſh his Lordſhip had condeſcended to explain, by what lawful exertion of the King's prerogative, the acts requiring the Oath of Supremacy to be taken, and the Declaration againſt Popery to be repeated and ſubſcribed, by all Members of both Houſes of Parliament, and by all the great officers of the State, can be diſpenſed with, or how theſe Acts can be repealed or altered, except by Parliament. The rejection of this Oath and Declaration by Romaniſts, is the only bar to their being on an exact level with Proteſtants as to all civil rights: what then can be his Lordſhip's meaning in inſinuating that Romaniſts may be put on an exact level with Proteſtants, by His Majeſty's exerting in every lawful way his legitimate powers, as contra-diſtinguiſhed from his concurrence with his Parliament? Does he mean to inſinuate that His Majeſty poſſeſſes a legitimate power to diſpenſe with the proviſions of Acts of Parliament? And if he does not, I hope his Lordſhip will take an occaſion of explaining this paſſage for the ſatisfaction as well of Iriſh as of Engliſh Proteſtants.

His Lordſhip proceeds to argue, 'I cannot admit 'the aſcendancy of one part of a nation over another 'part of the ſame nation, to the extent, and to the 'purpoſe claimed in Ireland (that is, the excluſion of 'Romaniſts from ſeats in Parliament, and from the 'great offices of the State, by the obligation of the Acts 'enjoining the taking of the Oath of Supremacy and 'the repeating and ſigning the Declaration), as capable of 'aſſuming any character deſerving the denomination 'of right; that which is wrong on one ſide, cannot, 'intelligibly to me, become a right in the other: wrong

'is

'is not a material of which it appears poſſible to con-
'ſtruct right. The virtues of poſſeſſion, preſcription,
'or any other limitation of time, which are ſuppoſed to
'cure the vices of a bad title, are not at all applicable
'to the caſe of perpetually ſubſiſting, and as it were
'renovating wrongs, eſpecially ſuch as affect the poli-
'tical rights of great numbers of men; inſtead of con-
'verting right into wrong, they only improve and for-
'tify the title of thoſe who ſuffer, to ſhake off the in-
'jury on the firſt opportunity that offers.' His Lord-
ſhip then ſtates, 'that the Catholics of Ireland not only
'claim a participation in civil franchiſes enjoyed by
'their Proteſtant countrymen, but they foſter claims
'on the property of Proteſtants, the preſent poſſeſſion
'of which they treat as mere uſurpation.' He then gives a fling, in the true French taſte, againſt the aſpiring character of *all Churches*, as he was obliged to admit that ſuch was the character of the Romiſh Church. With a good deal of caution he inſinuates, that titles to lands, or any thing elſe, by preſcription, are not the beſt; and that all titles of Iriſh Proteſtants, either to aſcendancy in political power, or to property, are by preſcription. The firſt he abſolutely condemns, as continuations of wrong; with reſpect to the other, the titles to landed property, he only '*hints a flaw, and* '*heſitates defect.*'

Notwithſtanding all this argument for the juſtice of the claims of Iriſh Romaniſts to political equality, and after ſtating, 'that their proſpect of obtaining it by the Treaty
'of Union between Great Britain and Ireland, is his prin-
'cipal reaſon for approving that meaſure; and after diſ-
'tinguiſhing the two claſſes of Iriſh Proteſtants and Ro-

'manifsts by an Eaft Indian term of *different caſts:* and 'ſtating, that they are inflamed againſt each other by 'mutual hatred, whoſe motives are irreconcilable, its 'character bitter, malignant, and implacable; that the 'ſovereign caſt of Iriſhmen (that is, Proteſtants) claim 'their ſovereignty as of right, and ground it on an old 'title of *conqueſt*, confirmed, *as they contend*, by poſſeſſion, 'acquieſcence, and *preſcription:*' and after drawing all this picture of the ſtate of Ireland, and in the middle of all his laboured argument of the *right* of Iriſh Romaniſts to *political equality*, his Lordſhip makes the following ingenuous confeſſion: 'I certainly pretend to no credit on 'ſuch points from *perſonal knowledge or inquiry*. I ſhould 'wiſh, therefore, to qualify any thing that may appear 'raſh or peremptory, in what I hazard on ſuch a ſubject, 'by avowing that degree of diffidence in my own views, 'which may be thought becoming with regard to facts, 'which though atteſted, I think, ſatisfactorily by others, 'have not fallen under my own obſervation.' It is ſincerely to be wiſhed, that his Lordſhip, confeſſing his own want of knowledge of the ſubject, had been leſs raſh and peremptory, and had not hazarded ſo much on the ſtate of Ireland, and on the ſubject of the claims of Iriſh Romaniſts to political equality (though, as his Lordſhip expreſſes himſelf, *he could not help ſympathizing with them*, and conſequently with all the members of Oppoſition both in Great Britain and Ireland; and with all the Jacobins in both kingdoms, who have repeatedly proclaimed a ſimilar ſympathy), becauſe his Lordſhip being a great diplomatic character, and high in the confidence of the Britiſh Government, does no ſmall miſchief to that very Government, in advancing and openly patronizing principles ſubverſive, not only of the Iriſh Conſtitution, *but of the Britiſh alſo*, as

 I hope

I hope to make evident, and that too without any neceſſity whatſoever for the promulgation of ſuch doctrines; which, ſo far from being favourable to an Incorporating Union of Great Britain and Ireland, tend to render the accompliſhment of that great meaſure more difficult, perhaps impracticable: and it is the more to be lamented, when it is conſidered, that the meaſure can be ſupported by irrefragable arguments of ſignal public advantage, without reſorting to ſuch fallacious and pernicious principles and doctrines.

I have been diligent in my inquiries reſpecting Lord Minto, as I have not the honour of the ſlighteſt perſonal acquaintance with his Lordſhip. From the information I have received, I find that he is a Scotch gentleman of family, and before his advancement to the Peerage, he was known by the name and title of Sir Gilbert Elliot, Bart. and had been for a time Viceroy of Corſica: he had contracted a great intimacy with Mr. Edmund Burke, the great Iriſh apoſtle of Popery already mentioned. He appears by the pamphlet I am now commenting upon, to be a perſon of learning and ſagacity: his abilities ſtand confeſſed by his being intruſted by the Britiſh Government with the execution of commiſſions of the greateſt importance, and with the moſt honourable embaſſies: his ſervices to his King and Country have raiſed him to the Britiſh Peerage. In this pamphlet he has collected the moſt powerful arguments, which have been urged, either in Great Britain or Ireland, in favour of an Incorporating Union of the two countries, and diſpoſed them in admirable order: though little is urged in it, which had not been already laid before the public; yet the arguments are digeſted in ſo perſpicuous and connected a ſeries, and diſ-

poſed of with ſo much judgment, that it may be ſaid to comprize in itſelf all the merit of all preceding publications on the ſubject: I think it a very valuable performance. With theſe ideas of it, I felt great pain on reading the paſſages I have quoted. The rank and ability of the writer, and the excellent reaſoning contained in the other parts of it, rendered a refutation of theſe exceptionable paragraphs and their doctrines a work of imperious neceſſity. Such are my only reaſon, and my only excuſe, for entering the liſts of argument with ſo great and ſo reſpectable a character as his Lordſhip, though I am as ſincere a friend to the meaſure of an Incorporating Union as his Lordſhip.

All his Lordſhip's arguments in favour of the claims of the Iriſh Romaniſts to political equality are founded on this one poſition, *that they are entitled to that equality by common right*. Common right, in the uſual acceptation of the word, means the common law of the land: but I preſume his Lordſhip means it in a more extended ſenſe, and that he means a right founded on the immutable rules of reaſon and juſtice. If this poſition is overturned, his Lordſhip's whole argument falls with it: it therefore demands examination. The rights of mankind in political ſocieties are twofold, natural and political: the firſt are born with a man, he becomes entitled to them the moment of his birth; but as man is a ſocial animal, and as the human race cannot ſubſiſt but in ſociety, he becomes entitled to them with this limitation, that the enjoyment of them is to be regulated by that ſociety of which he is born a member, whilſt he continues one of that ſociety. The ſociety may eſtabliſh certain rules for its own preſervation, and without which it cannot ſubſiſt, reſtraining

and modifying the full exercise of what are called natural rights, in cases where the full exercise of natural rights would endanger the existence or security of the society; and regulations for the secure enjoyment of natural rights thus modified. To these rules and regulations all members of all political societies must submit; and all the benefits men enjoy under these laws are their political rights. In fact, mankind's political rights, are their natural rights modified, and their enjoyment secured, by the laws of society. Natural rights are immutable; modifications of them by the laws of society are various, in the various societies of mankind on the face of the globe; and hence they are styled political rights as distinguished from natural. The laws of each society have been originally framed on the consent of the majority of the community, either tacit or express: general acquiescence implies tacit consent: actual compact, as is the case in some societies, is express consent. These rules have been altered in societies at times by tyranny and usurpation. In the British Empire, the common law is that system of law which is established by tacit consent for ages: the statute law is that system of law which is established by consent or agreement of the members. In great or even considerable empires or governments, it is utterly impracticable to collect the opinions of all the members of the society taken by the poll, on any public measure: such an attempt would tend to inevitable confusion and dissolution of the society; because the great mass of the people in all States, subsisting by bodily labour, are ignorant, and incapable in general of forming correct opinions on great and momentous political questions. By the British Constitution, generally and deservedly esteemed the very essence of political wisdom, the method of collecting the opinions of the majority of

the nation, for the purpoſe of enacting new laws, or altering or abrogating the old ones, is partly by the votes of the majority of a certain claſs of great and diſtinguiſhed perſonages eminent for their dignity and property: but chiefly by the votes of the majority of Repreſentatives choſen by the people, and aſſembled in general Council or Parliament: theſe Repreſentatives, though they repreſent the whole body or maſs of the people, yet are not elected by the majority of votes of the people of each diſtrict reckoned by the poll, but by their property: and one twentieth part of the people at large are not qualified, by their property, to vote at the elections of their Repreſentatives in Parliament either in England or Ireland.

What Lord Minto ſtyles the ſovereignty of the Proteſtants in Ireland over the Iriſh Romaniſts conſiſts in this: that Proteſtants are capable of ſitting in Parliament, and of filling about thirty of the great offices of the State, to which the exerciſe of the ſupreme Executive Power is intruſted: and the Romaniſts exclude themſelves from theſe two capacities by rejecting the Oath of Supremacy and Declaration, as already mentioned: both which the Proteſtants take and ſubſcribe on being admitted into Parliament, or into any of theſe offices. In every other particular there is a perfect equality of political privileges at preſent between Iriſh Proteſtants and Romaniſts. The Iriſh Proteſtants maintain that the aforeſaid excluſion of Iriſh Romaniſts (which his Lordſhip is pleaſed to ſtyle Proteſtant Sovereignty and Monopoly; terms learned in the Schola Burkeiana) had its origin in political right, and in the very firſt of political rights, to wit, that of the State to preſerve its own exiſtence, and independence of all foreign juriſdictions: and whatever aſcendancy (ſtyled by his Lordſhip

Lordſhip Sovereignty) this excluſion has conferred on Iriſh Proteſtants, they claim the ſame, not, as his Lordſhip very erroneouſly ſuppoſes, on the title of conqueſt, of acquieſcence or preſcription; but on the ſtatute law of the land, enacted both in England and Ireland. And I cannot ſufficiently expreſs my amazement at this very extraordinary miſtake of his Lordſhip, a great diplomatic character, and ſuppoſed to be perfectly well acquainted with the laws of his country!

The excluſion of Romaniſts from all public offices in England and Ireland, commenced with the operation of the Statute which enacts the Oath of Supremacy, and which was enacted in England in the firſt, and in Ireland in the ſecond year of Queen Elizabeth: and all acceſs to ſuch offices in England has been doubly barred, as againſt Romaniſts, by the Teſt and Corporation Acts. (See Appendix, No. 3.) In Ireland theſe two Acts, there alſo enacted, have been with great precipitancy, not to ſay want of political wiſdom, repealed in 1793; except ſo far as relates to the great offices of the State already mentioned. The excluſion of Romaniſts from ſeats in Parliament, ariſing from the Oath of Supremacy and Declaration, took place in England by the operation of the Statute of the 30th of Charles the Second, chap. 2; and the doors of Parliament were further barred againſt them in England by the Statute of the 1ſt of George the Firſt, chap. 13, both which Statutes are yet unrepealed: they were both enacted ſoon after in Ireland. By theſe Statutes, to prevent crude innovations in Religion and Government, it is enacted, that no Member ſhall ſit or vote in either Houſe of Parliament, till he hath, in the preſence of the Houſe, taken the Oaths of

Supremacy, Allegiance, and Abjuration; and repeated and ſubſcribed the Declaration againſt Tranſubſtantiation, Invocation of Saints, and Sacrifice of the Maſs. (See Engliſh Statutes, and 1ſt Blackſtone's Commentaries, p. 158, octavo edition.) By the 22d article of the Union of England and Scotland, all Scotch Members are obliged to take the ſame Oaths, and ſubſcribe the ſame Declaration: and in the Act ratifying the Treaty of Union of England and Scotland two Acts of the reſpective Parliaments of the two nations are recited, the one providing for the perpetual eſtabliſhment and maintenance of the Preſbyterian Church in Scotland, the other for the perpetual eſtabliſhment and maintenance of the Church of England, in England, Wales, *Ireland*, and the town of Berwick upon Tweed: and theſe two Acts are therein declared to be fundamental and eſſential conditions of that Union. (See Defoe's Hiſtory of the Union of England and Scotland, from page 557 to 562, and the Engliſh Statutes.) How then can his Lordſhip maintain that the excluſion of Iriſh Romaniſts from Parliament, and the aforeſaid offices, which he, adopting the phraſeology of his Gamaliel, Mr. Edmund Burke, is pleaſed to ſtyle Proteſtant Sovereignty, Aſcendancy, and Monopoly, is a wrong; and its continuance a continuance of wrong? He muſt mean, that it is a reſtriction of the natural rights of man, which is not required by that firſt of political objects, the ſafety and preſervation of the State; or that it is not conformable to the opinions of the majority of the members of the community, and therefore unjuſt. As to the firſt, I have already proved, that Romaniſts, from their religious doctrines, ought not to be admitted to the enjoyment of any portion of the Sovereignty of a Proteſtant State; and that they

ſhould

ſhould be excluded from the Houſes of Lords and Commons, both in Great Britain and Ireland, becauſe it would be highly injurious, and perhaps, in Ireland, deſtructive to the State to admit them; and conſequently that it is no wrong to exclude them. If their excluſion is a wrong in Ireland, it muſt be a wrong in Great Britain; for the principles of natural juſtice are immutable, and not variable by the circumſtance of their being more numerous in Ireland than in Great Britain. What is right or wrong in this particular in the one country, muſt be right or wrong in the other. Their excluſion in Ireland is more requiſite than in Great Britain, on account of their greater numbers in the former country, and their claims to all the landed property in the hands of Proteſtants, the poſſeſſion of which, his Lordſhip ſtates, they conſider as *uſurpation:* and Dr. Troy, as before mentioned, ſtates, that they conſider the Proteſtant Eſtabliſhment an *uſurpation*. Theſe circumſtances render their elevation in Ireland more dangerous than in Great Britain, and their excluſion in the former country more juſt and reaſonable.

If his Lordſhip thinks the excluſion of Romaniſts from Parliament and the great offices of the State a wrong, he muſt think that all the great ſtateſmen in Britain and Ireland, ſince the commencement of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, were workers of iniquity; and all the Statutes enacted ſince, reſpecting Romaniſts, public wrongs; he muſt think King James the Second was perfectly juſtifiable in endeavouring to remedy this wrong; the glorious King William the Third an uſurper; and all who aſſiſted in the Revolution of 1688 Rebels. His Lordſhip declares it to be his warmeſt

wiſh

wiſh to eſtabliſh Iriſh Romaniſts in an equality of civil rights with Iriſh Proteſtants; King James the Second profeſſed nothing more. He profeſſed ſimilar deſigns in England. His attempts to carry theſe deſigns into execution, both in England and Ireland, coſt him his crown, and conſigned him and his luckleſs progeny to perpetual exile.

His Lordſhip cannot arraign the aforeſaid Statutes of injuſtice in excluding Romaniſts, on the principle that they are not conformable to the opinion of the majority of the Iriſh nation: for, waving the argument of the ſuperior number by the poll of the Proteſtants in Great Britain and Ireland, taken together, over the Romaniſts, and conſidering Ireland a diſtinct and independent nation (which it is not), let his Lordſhip's principle be examined by the principles of the Conſtitution: by that conſtitution, the Repreſentatives of the People are elected by the People, reckoned, not by their numbers by the poll, but by their property: thirty-nine parts out of forty of Iriſh property are in the hands of Iriſh Proteſtants, conſequently the conſtitutional power of election is poſſeſſed by the Iriſh Proteſtants, though Romaniſts now enjoy the elective franchiſe, as well as Proteſtants: the Houſe of Commons, ſo elected, together with the Lords and the Monarch, have enacted theſe Statutes, by the operation of which Romaniſts are excluded; that is, they were enacted by the true legitimate Sovereign Power of the State. The very capacity of ſitting in Parliament and enjoying public offices is a political right, merely ariſing from the inſtitutions of civil ſociety, and may juſtly be withheld or abridged by the ſupreme conſtitutional power of that ſociety, when it deems

deems the exertion of its authority in ſuch particulars conducive to the well-being of the State. With what propriety or truth can his Lordſhip then maintain, that the excluſion of Romaniſts from certain political ſituations, effected by the operation of Statutes enacted by Parliament, aſſembled purſuant to the principles of the Conſtitution, is a wrong, and an unjuſt invaſion of their natural rights? It is a poſition not to be ſupported by reaſon or argument!

I truſt I have fairly lopped off the firſt horn of his Lordſhip's dilemma, to wit, that excluſion of Iriſh Romaniſts cannot be ſupported, and conſequent Proteſtant aſcendancy maintained, without violation of the natural rights of the Iriſh Romaniſts, and continuation of the injuſtice. I have reduced his two-horned bugbear to an unicorn; and I will preſerve the remaining horn, to wit, that the excluſion of Iriſh Romaniſts cannot be repealed, and their claims acceded to, without detriment to the Proteſtant Eſtabliſhment in Ireland, to gore and lacerate (to uſe his own words) the remainder of his Lordſhip's argument with: nay more, I will ſharpen this horn, and prove, that the admiſſion of Iriſh Romaniſts into Parliament and the great offices of the State, would, in the event of an Incorporating Union of Great Britain and Ireland taking place, be ſubverſive of the Conſtitution of the Empire in general; and that the publication and ſupport of ſuch a project by great Miniſters of State are very likely to diſincline the real friends of the Conſtitution in Church and State, as well in Great Britain as Ireland, to the meaſure of an Union.

However,

However, before I begin to uſe the horn, it is not improper to take notice, that his Lordſhip has inſinuated that Iriſh Proteſtants hold their eſtates under the titles of Conqueſt or Preſcription. Conqueſt is in general a title founded on wrong; and the title by Preſcription his Lordſhip endeavours to diſcredit. I am extremely ſorry to be obliged to obſerve, that his Lordſhip here manifeſts much want of knowledge of the real ſituation and circumſtances of Ireland, and that his Gamaliel has led him again into a groſs error. If any eſtates in Ireland can at this day be ſaid to be enjoyed under the title of Conqueſt, they muſt be ſuch as were acquired by the firſt Britiſh adventurers in Ireland in the reign of Henry the Second. His acquiſition of Ireland cannot properly be called a Conqueſt; for though he arrived in Ireland at the head of an army, the whole Iriſh nation, as I before obſerved, ſubmitted, and ſwore fealty to him, and choſe him for their Monarch, without putting him to the neceſſity of ſtriking a blow. Of the great eſtates acquired by his followers, ſome were gained, not by force, but by lawful conveyance and ſucceſſion: ſuch was that of Richard de Clare, Earl of Chepſtow, ſurnamed Strongbow, who married the only daughter and child of the King of Leinſter, and became in her right entitled to a vaſt territory in that province, in which he ſettled a great number of his vaſſals; and which always, till the reign of Elizabeth, was the moſt conſiderable ſeat of the Engliſh Colony in Ireland, and great part of it was called the Pale, or the Territory governed by Engliſh Laws. However, whether the firſt Engliſh adventurers gained their eſtates by the ſword, or otherwiſe, I apprehend to be at this day of little conſequence, for there is ſcarce remaining a ſingle eſtate in this kingdom

dom which is not held by titles derived from Elizabeth, or her ſucceſſors, by Patents, Acts of Parliament, or other good and ſufficient conveyances. And it might be ſaid, with more reaſon, that all the great families in England, moſt of whom yet retain their Norman ſurnames, and whoſe anceſtors obtained eſtates in the reign of William the Conqueror, held theſe eſtates by Conqueſt. For the acquiſition of England by William preceded the acquiſition of Ireland by Henry only by one century; and a much greater proportion of perſons in Ireland, poſſeſſing landed eſtates, have old Iriſh ſurnames, than perſons of the ſame deſcription in England, who have Saxon, or old Britiſh ſurnames.

The inſinuation, that many Iriſh Proteſtants derive the titles of their eſtates from preſcription, is equally groundleſs. After the firſt acquiſition of Ireland by the Engliſh Crown, there does not ſeem to have been any very great influx of Engliſh into Ireland for ſome centuries. The civil wars of York and Lancaſter drew out of Ireland moſt of the great Engliſh families which had ſettled in it, together with their vaſſals, and moſt of them periſhed in that unhappy conteſt. The greater part of the remainder of the Engliſh Colony adopted the barbarous Iriſh cuſtoms, and degenerated into Iriſh barbarians. After the acceſſion of Elizabeth, the Earl of Deſmond, a great and powerful Nobleman in Munſter, of Engliſh extraction, rebelled againſt her; ſhe ſubdued him, and all his vaſt poſſeſſions were forfeited to the Crown: ſhe granted them to a conſiderable colony of Engliſh ſettlers. The great and formidable Rebellion of the Earl of Tyrone broke out afterwards in her reign: he poſſeſſed, by himſelf or his vaſſals, almoſt

almoſt the whole province of Ulſter. The Queen, after a long, expenſive, and deſtructive war, which deſolated the country, completely vanquiſhed him, but died before ſhe could reap the fruits of her victory. Her ſucceſſor, James the Firſt, employed his whole reign in improving the nation; he divided part of the lands forfeited in this Rebellion, and another which followed cloſe on its heels, among Engliſh and Scotch ſettlers, and his loyal Iriſh Proteſtant ſubjects, and the reſt he parcelled out among the native Iriſh. His ſon, Charles the Firſt, followed his example; and a great part of the Iriſh nation, which held their lands by preſcription, ſurrendered them to the Crown, and paſſed patents for them, conforming to the Engliſh law of tenures, either in capite or ſocage. When Cromwell had reduced the Iriſh Rebels, he divided the lands forfeited by the Rebellion among the ſoldiers, adventurers, and loyal Iriſh Proteſtants. Such of his grants as ſtill ſubſiſt, and a large portion of Ireland is held under them, were confirmed immediately after the Reſtoration, by the Acts of Settlement and Explanation. The forfeitures of the Rebels in the reign of King William have been alſo diſpoſed of by patents among the King's loyal ſubjects. And all theſe eſtates, ſince the original grants of them, have been conveyed over and over again, for valuable conſiderations, by family ſettlements, and by purchaſes, inſomuch that there is ſcarcely one eſtate in the whole Kingdom of Ireland held by the title of preſcription; the original grants of them all can be produced, or are recited in the different conveyances. But if they were held by preſcription, as his Lordſhip erroneouſly ſuppoſes, a poſſeſſion of two hundred years from the reign of Elizabeth; of one hundred and fifty, at leaſt, from the

reigns

reigns of James and Charles; of near an hundred and fifty from the time of Cromwell; and of upwards of one hundred ſince the laſt forfeitures in the reign of King William, would conſtitute a good title to the preſent poſſeſſors by the laws of Great Britain and Ireland, which make ſixty years undiſturbed poſſeſſion a good title, and a bar in a writ of right.

As a conſiderable part of the landed eſtates in the poſſeſſion of Iriſh Proteſtants conſiſts of lands forfeited to the Crown in the different Rebellions I have mentioned, when his Lordſhip hints that Iriſh Proteſtants derive their titles to their eſtates from Conqueſt, he muſt mean, that the ſuppreſſion of every Rebellion is a Conqueſt. The juſt rights of a conqueror are pretty accurately defined by Mr. Locke, in his Treatiſe on Government, but the conduct of a conqueror to the vanquiſhed is generally meaſured by his will and pleaſure; and is the exerciſe of an arbitrary tyranny over their perſons and properties: and his Lordſhip's view, in inſinuating that the titles of Iriſh Proteſtants to their eſtates are founded in Conqueſt, ſeems to be, to diſparage Iriſh Proteſtants, as deriving their properties from the exertions of unlawful violence and rapacity; that is, in plain Engliſh, that they are the heirs of robbers and plunderers; as has, indeed, been already aſſerted by the abuſive Author of '*Conſiderations on the State of Public Affairs in the Year* 1799.' I never before heard it inſinuated, that the ſuppreſſion of a Rebellion was a Conqueſt of the nation: Conqueſt entirely changes the laws, conſtitution, and government of a nation; but the ſuppreſſion of a Rebellion, in part of a nation (and in every Rebellion a part of a nation only is engaged),

gaged), does not change the laws, conſtitution, and government of a nation: it, on the contrary, eſtabliſhes them all, and gives them additional ſecurity. Are the ſuppreſſions of all the various Rebellions in England, ſince the acceſſion of William the Firſt to the preſent day, to be conſidered as Conqueſts of England? And is the ſuppreſſion of every Rebellion in Ireland, ſince the acceſſion of Henry the Second, to be conſidered as a new Conqueſt of Ireland? the very ſuppoſition is an abſurdity. Rebellion is High Treaſon; its guilt and its puniſhment are accurately defined by the laws of England and Ireland, and one part of the puniſhment is the forfeiture of the property of Rebels to the Crown: the Crown diſpoſes of this forfeited property to its loyal ſubjects, in reward of their ſervices, or for other valuable conſiderations; and the Grantees of the Crown hold ſuch property by a legal title, not founded on Conqueſt, but on the known and eſtabliſhed laws of the land. But whatever was his Lordſhip's view in inſinuating that the Iriſh Proteſtants held their eſtates by the title of Conqueſt, and that the Iriſh Romaniſts, being unjuſtly diſpoſſeſſed, had a right to reclaim them, whether it was to diſparage or to intimidate, Iriſh Proteſtants, conſcious of the juſtice and lawfulneſs of their titles, and of their own ſtrength and courage to defend them againſt all attempts of Iriſh Romaniſts, read ſuch inſinuations with the moſt perfect apathy, as they do all his Lordſhip's laboured doubts reſpecting the efficacy of a title by preſcription; and were it not for the high reſpect I entertain for his Lordſhip, I might make uſe of a harſher expreſſion.

I now

I now arm myſelf with the remaining horn of his Lordſhip's dilemma, to wit, *that the admiſſion of Iriſh Romaniſts into Parliament, and to the great executive offices of the State, would be very prejudicial to the Iriſh Proteſtants, and would much endanger the eſtabliſhed Conſtitution in Ireland.* To render this horn ſtill more formidable, I can furniſh it with a very ſtrong and very ſharp antler, to wit, *that ſuch admiſſion would, in caſe of an Union, greatly endanger the Britiſh Conſtitution, and muſt be attended with an Innovation in it; which, I truſt, will be reprobated by His Majeſty; by the great Miniſter, who now with ſo much glory to himſelf, and advantage to the Nation, takes the lead in the Britiſh Cabinet; and by all the loyal Proteſtant inhabitants of Great Britain:* and that, ſo far from promoting an Union, the very propoſal of ſo dangerous an innovation, muſt throw the greateſt impediments in the way of that moſt ſalutary meaſure.

The danger of admitting Iriſh Romaniſts into Parliament in Ireland, that is, into a ſhare of the ſovereign authority of the State, I have already very fully expoſed. The appointment of a Romiſh Viceroy of Ireland, of a Romiſh Lord Chancellor, of Romiſh Judges, of a Romiſh Commander in Chief of the army, and the admiſſion of Romiſh Peers and Commoners into Parliament, muſt all tend to the ſubverſion of the Iriſh Proteſtant Eſtabliſhment, both in Church and State; this is ſo notorious, that no arguments are required to prove it: it is evident that ſuch appointments, and ſuch admiſſion, would of themſelves be a ſubverſion of the preſent eſtabliſhment. This horn without the antler is ſufficient to lacerate all his Lordſhip's arguments in the preſent ſituation of Great Britain and Ireland.

Let

Let us now ſuppoſe that an Incorporating Union of the two countries had taken place, and that they were conſolidated into one body. If in ſuch caſe Romaniſts were to be admitted into Parliament, and to fill the great offices of the State, all the laws enacted in England againſt Popery, ſince the acceſſion of Queen Elizabeth, muſt be repealed. I will mention ſome of theſe Acts particularly, that *the People of England may clearly underſtand the momentous and dangerous alterations which muſt be made in the Britiſh Conſtitution*, which has been improving from the commencement of the reign of Elizabeth, till it has attained its preſent unrivalled excellence; under which the preſent generation and their anceſtors for two centuries have lived; and which has deſcended to the People of England during that period, in ſucceſſion from father to ſon, as an inheritance; if what Lord Minto ſtyles *the preſent humiliating and degrading excluſion of the Catholic part of the Iriſh nation* ſhall be done away, by the adoption of his ſcheme of conferring equal privileges on them with their fellow-ſubjects, in caſe of an Union.

The Act of the 1ſt of Elizabeth, which enjoins the taking of the Oath of Supremacy by all public officers; the Bill of Rights, the 1ſt of William and Mary, new-modelling the Oath of Supremacy, and extending the ſphere of the operation of the Act of Elizabeth in reſpect to that Oath, muſt be repealed. The Acts of the 30th of Charles the Second, chap. 2, and the 1ſt of George the Firſt, chap. 13, enacting that no Member ſhall ſit or vote in either Houſe of Parliament, till he hath, in the preſence of the Houſe, taken the Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration, and repeated and ſubſcribed the Declaration, muſt be repealed. The

Teſt Act, requiring all officers, civil and military, to take the above Oaths, repeat and ſubſcribe the Declaration, and receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, according to the uſage of the Church of England, muſt be repealed: the Corporation Act muſt ſhare the ſame fate. Theſe two Acts, Blackſtone ſtates to be bulwarks of the Conſtitution, and that they were enacted to ſecure the eſtabliſhed Church againſt perils from Non-conformiſts of all denominations, among which he particularly enumerates *Papiſts*. (See Blackſtone's Commentaries, vol. iv. page 57, octavo edition.) And he ſtates, that the Acts of Charles the Second and George the Firſt, requiring all Members of both Houſes of Parliament to take the Oaths, and repeat and ſubſcribe the Declaration, were enacted, to prevent crude innovations in Religion and Government. (See Blackſtone's Commentaries, vol. i. page 158, octavo edition.) The articles and proviſions of the Treaty of Union of England and Scotland muſt be altered: that one, among others, which enjoins the taking of the Coronation Oath by His Majeſty; and more particularly thoſe parts of the Treaty ſtyled by Blackſtone fundamental and eſſential conditions of the Union. (See Blackſtone's Commentaries, 1ſt vol. pages 92, 93, octavo edition.) I have quoted Blackſtone on theſe points, to ſhow the opinions of that able conſtitutional lawyer on the parts of the *Engliſh* laws relating to Papiſts; becauſe in his remarks on the *Engliſh Popery Code*, he expreſſes his opinion, that ſeveral parts of it, which he enumerates, may be repealed without inconvenience; but the parts I have above mentioned, he thinks eſſentially neceſſary to the preſervation of the Proteſtant Eſtabliſhment in Church and State in *England*, and that they cannot be repealed

conſiſtently with the ſafety of that eſtabliſhment in *England*, or with the continuation of the Union of England and Scotland.

It may be here argued, that an Incorporating Union of Great Britain and Ireland may be effected, without all the aforeſaid alterations in the laws of England; for ſtipulations may be inſerted in the Treaty of an Union of the two nations, that Iriſh Romaniſts, elected in Ireland members of the imperial Parliament, ſhall ſit and vote therein, without taking the Oaths, or ſubſcribing the Declaration above-mentioned; and that they ſhall be capable of filling public offices in Ireland on the ſame terms. And it may be urged, in reſpect to offices, that ſuch ſtipulations have taken place in the Act of Union of England and Scotland; for Scotchmen are by that Act capable of filling public offices in Scotland, without taking the Oaths preſcribed to be taken by public officers in England, and without receiving the Sacrament according to the uſage of the Church of England. On the part of this argument which relates to public offices, I ſhall only obſerve, that public officers in Scotland, as I am informed, are obliged to take oaths and engagements full as hoſtile to Popery, as thoſe enjoined to be taken by public officers in England, *which they were obliged to take in their own country before the Union:* and that no Scotchman can enjoy any office in England without taking the Oaths, and receiving the Sacrament as preſcribed in England. But with reſpect to the capacity of ſitting in Parliament, ſuch ſtipulations can receive no ſort of countenance from the conditions of the Union of England and Scotland; for the Scotch Members are not admitted to ſit in the Parliament of Great

Britain, without taking the ſame Oaths, and repeating and ſubſcribing the ſame Declaration, as the Engliſh Members are obliged to take, repeat, and ſubſcribe. I will therefore proceed to examine the practicability and juſtice of the inſertion of ſuch ſtipulations in a treaty of Incorporating Union of Great Britain and Ireland; and their efficacy in removing the preſent complaints of the Iriſh Romaniſts, in caſe they were inſerted.

It is firſt to be obſerved, that by the eſtabliſhed Conſtitution of Ireland, ſince the latter end of the reign of Charles the Second, the Romaniſts are excluded from Parliament by the Oaths, which it is enacted all members ſhall take, previous to their admiſſion to ſit or vote in either Houſe; they are excluded from the great offices of the State by the ſame means: and that by Lord Minto's ſcheme, to raiſe them from their preſent *degraded and humiliated condition* (as he ſtyles it), the preſent laws of Ireland enjoining the taking of theſe Oaths are to be repealed, preparative to an Union of the two countries; or by the treaty of Union itſelf to be ratified by the Parliaments of Great Britain and Ireland. He admits that ſuch ſcheme, whilſt the Parliaments of the two countries remain ſeparate and diſtinct, would be very dangerous to the Proteſtant Eſtabliſhment in Church and State in Ireland, if carried into effect; becauſe, as he reaſons, the ſuperior number of Romaniſts in Ireland, when put on a perfect equality with Proteſtants in reſpect to civil privileges, would enable them by degrees to engroſs the whole power of the State, and overturn the Proteſtant Eſtabliſhment in Ireland. Now, ſuppoſing the two countries were conſolidated into one body politic by an Union, and Romaniſts put on a perfect equality of civil privileges with Proteſtants

in Ireland; they would, according to his Lordſhip's reaſoning, in time return all the Iriſh Members to the Houſe of Commons of the imperial Parliament. It is propoſed that Ireland, on an Union, ſhall have one hundred Repreſentatives in the imperial Commons: if theſe ſhould be all, or a great part of them, Romaniſts, it would not be very difficult for them, on many occaſions, where a Miniſter might ſtand in need of their ſervices, to obtain a domineering influence with reſpect to all Iriſh affairs: it appears at preſent, though they have little political power in Ireland, that they have procured an intereſt in the Britiſh Cabinet, very alarming to every attached friend to the Conſtitution in Church and State in Ireland: this would be increaſed a thouſand fold, if an Union took place on the terms ſuggeſted by Lord Minto: in truth, the Proteſtant Eſtabliſhment in Ireland could not ſurvive ſuch an event for many ſeſſions. And I beg of his Lordſhip, and other great Britiſh Stateſmen, ſeriouſly to conſider, whether their propoſing ſchemes of Union, ſubverſive of the Proteſtant Eſtabliſhment in Ireland, is a likely method of inducing Iriſh Proteſtants, in whoſe hands, for the preſent, almoſt the whole political power of the State is lodged, to conſent to an Union: and whether the continued intrigues of every Britiſh Stateſman, for ſome years paſt ſent into Ireland, to act as the Miniſter, with the Iriſh Romaniſts, for the depreſſion of the Proteſtant intereſt in that kingdom, and the elevation of Popery on its ruins, are likely to incline Iriſh Proteſtants to commit all their civil and religious rights, and thoſe of their poſterity, to the abſolute diſpoſal of perſons who ſhow no diſpoſition to ſupport and maintain them. Lord Minto admits, that Great Britain is bound to ſupport the Iriſh Proteſtants

by

by every tie of gratitude, for their unalterable attachment to the intereſts of the Britiſh Empire: they deſire no ſupport from Great Britain, as againſt Romaniſts, the common political enemy of Britiſh, as well as Iriſh Proteſtants: all Proteſtants, in the eyes of Iriſh Romaniſts, are Engliſhmen, and *vice verſâ*: they have but one name for both: they are eternal and implacable enemies of Proteſtants, from the tenets of their religion: Iriſh Proteſtants are able, without any ſupport from Great Britain, to protect themſelves from all the force, from all the fury, from all the rancour of Iriſh Romaniſts: all they require from Britiſh Proteſtants is, that they will not join in a hollow league with the avowed enemies both of Engliſh and Iriſh Proteſtants, againſt Iriſh Proteſtants: they have not merited ſuch treatment from Britiſh Proteſtants, they have ever remained faithful to the Britiſh Crown, they are now ſupporting it with their blood and treaſure, ſpilling and laviſhing one and the other in the preſent glorious conteſt! Give them, then, illuſtrious Britiſh Statefmen, no cauſe to exclaim, in the language of the Roman poet,

Perierunt tempora longi ſervitii!

They are ready to coaleſce with you, but not on terms which in the end will be found equally detrimental to you and them: they demand, nay entreat no more from you, as the condition of an Incorporating Union, than the preſervation of their preſent Conſtitution in Church and State; and they deprecate only its ſubverſion.

I ſhall now make a few obſervations on the juſtice, efficacy, and practicability of ſuch a ſcheme of Union when conſidered in reſpect to Great Britain. By this ſcheme Iriſh Romaniſts muſt be admitted into the imperial Par-

 liament;

liament; and by his Lordſhip's reaſoning, excluſive of Romiſh Iriſh Lords, a great proportion, and in time the whole number of Iriſh Commoners, to wit, one hundred, which are to be admitted into the imperial Commons, will be Romaniſts; conſequently the above-mentioned Engliſh Acts of Charles the Second and George the Firſt muſt be repealed in favour of Iriſh Romaniſts; in fact, they muſt be entirely repealed, becauſe it would be highly abſurd to exclude Engliſh and Scotch Romaniſts, when Iriſh Romaniſts are admitted. When thus they have gained admiſſion into the Houſes of Lords and Commons in the imperial Parliament, and formed conſequently no inconſiderable part of the ſupreme power of the State, in violation of every principle of the Britiſh Conſtitution ſince the commencement of the reign of Elizabeth; the Britiſh Miniſter, to ſecure the ſupport of ſo powerful a body in Parliament, muſt deliver into their hands the whole patronage of Ireland. The Proteſtant Eſtabliſhment of that nation muſt be ſubverted, and all public offices there muſt be filled with Romaniſts. If any ſtipulations ſhall be made in the treaty of Union, for the ſecurity of the Proteſtant Eſtabliſhment in Ireland; though ſuch treaty be ratified by the Parliaments of both countries previous to the Union, and by the imperial Parliament after; yet ſuch ſtipulations cannot ſubſiſt for any length of time. No doubt can be entertained, that the imperial Parliament, being the ſupreme authority of the Empire, will be competent to alter or abrogate the conditions and articles of the Union at its pleaſure; and if it ſhould alter or abrogate ſuch articles as relate to the Proteſtant Eſtabliſhment in Ireland, at the expreſs inſtance and deſire of the Repreſentatives of Ireland in the imperial Parliament, aſſiſted by the Britiſh Romiſh members, who could complain

complain on behalf of Ireland, of the infringement of the treaty of Union? or who could complain with effect? If the Repreſentatives of Scotland in the Parliament of Great Britain ſhould demand an alteration of the articles and conditions of the Union, relating only to Scotland, and the Parliament of Great Britain ſhould comply with ſuch demand, would any complaint be made on behalf of Scotland of the infringement of the treaty of Union? or, if made, would it be followed by any material effect? The maxim of *Volenti non fit injuria* would be the anſwer to ſuch complaints. When Ireland was by ſuch means converted into a Romiſh country, would its Repreſentatives in the imperial Parliament, and the Romiſh Britiſh Members, be contented? would their conſtituents be contented? Certainly not. Scotchmen are capable of filling the higheſt employments in England, complying with the Teſt Act; and the Preſbyterian doctrines oppoſe no inſurmountable barriers againſt ſuch compliance; but the Romiſh do. Many natives of Scotland have riſen to the higheſt ſtations in England ſince the Union: the preſent Lord Chancellor of England, Mr. Secretary Dundas, Admiral Duncan, Sir Ralph Abercrombie, Lord Minto himſelf, with multitudes of others, are preſent, the late Lord Mansfield and others, paſt examples, of the great elevation to which the ſhining abilities of North-Britons have raiſed them in England. In caſe of an Incorporating Union of Great Britain and Ireland, Iriſh Proteſtants being capable of filling high offices in England, the abilities of ſome of that deſcription might promote them to elevated dignities there. But Britiſh and Iriſh Romaniſts would be excluded, by the Engliſh Teſt Act, from all public offices in England, and from being officers in any corporations

porations in England by the Corporation Act. How loud then would the exclamations of the Romiſh Members of both Houſes of the imperial Parliament be againſt the Teſt and Corporation Acts! They would repreſent, that though, by an Incorporating Union, Great Britain and Ireland were conſolidated into one nation, yet they by theſe Acts were deprived of the benefits of the Britiſh Conſtitution in four fifths of that conſolidated nation by theſe Acts, and admitted only to a ſhare with all their fellow-ſubjects in the public employments, emoluments, and political power of the remaining fifth; all their ſubjects being alſo admiſſible to employments in that fifth. They would loudly complain, as they at preſent do, of this inequality of condition with their fellow-citizens, and inſiſt that they were excluded from the rights of citizenſhip. If the Miniſter of the day ſtood in need of their aſſiſtance in Parliament, as he often would, he muſt liſten to ſuch complaints, and liſten with favour! If ſimilar complaints of the Romiſh party are attended to at preſent, when they are deſtitute of political power, much more attention muſt be paid to them, when they ſhall form a conſiderable part of the ſupreme power of the State. At the Miniſter's beck, how many Lord Mintos would be found ready to join in the cry of the Romiſh pack! how loud would they bellow in the ears of the imperial Parliament *the degraded and humiliated ſtate of Britiſh and Iriſh Catholics!* It is not impoſſible, that both the Teſt and Corporation Acts might be thus cried down: and what Blackſtone ſo juſtly ſtyles the bulwarks of the Conſtitution, defending the Eſtabliſhed Church from all perils from Non-conformiſts of all deſcriptions, and the Conſtitution from all innovations in Religion and Government, might be completely overthrown and deſtroyed; and the deluge of Republicaniſm

and

and Superſtition, and their certain attendant, Infidelity, let in to overwhelm the Britiſh Empire.

But let us ſuppoſe, that the ſound good ſenſe and ſpirit of the people of Great Britain ſhould reſiſt and defeat theſe attempts to repeal the Teſt and Corporation Acts. The certain conſequences of an Union with ſuch ſtipulations in favour of Iriſh Romaniſts as I have ſtated, would be, that both Engliſh and Iriſh Romaniſts in the imperial Parliament would take every method to manifeſt their hoſtility to the Conſtitution: they would be found the conſtant ſupporters of every oppoſition to the meaſures of Government in Parliament; they would be the ſteady allies of the whole Jacobin faction: Engliſh and Iriſh Romaniſts would by themſelves form a powerful party in the imperial Legiſlature; they would be the patrons and the partiſans of every factious project, of every deſperate diſappointed leader in either Houſe of Parliament; the avowed ſupporters of every attempt to overturn and deſtroy the Conſtitution of their country. And I leave it to Britiſh Stateſmen, and particularly to that renowned Miniſter, who has ſo glorioufly and ſucceſsfully ſtood forth the protector and ſupporter of Chriſtianity, of lawful government, of humanity and juſtice in Europe, to conſider, whether ſuch ſchemes of aggrandizement of Romaniſts in the Britiſh Empire are practicable; and, if practicable, whether they are conſiſtent with the principles of ſound policy and juſtice; and whether any political arrangements whatſoever, ſhort of conſigning to them the whole power of the State, will content Romaniſts; and whether any favours conferred upon them will render them a whit better ſubjects to a Proteſtant Britiſh Government, than they are at preſent: whether

all

all ſuch arguments as are advanced by Lord Minto, do not directly tend to retard, perhaps to defeat, the accompliſhment of that great and highly beneficial meaſure, an Incorporating Union of Great Britain and Ireland, by alarming the Proteſtants of both countries with fears of the ſubverſion of the preſent Conſtitution in Church and State, as the unavoidable conſequence of ſuch a meaſure, on the terms and conditions propoſed by his Lordſhip: whether any neceſſity ever exiſted for propoſing ſuch terms and conditions: whether they have not their origin in the deceptive, deſtructive, falſe, and erroneous doctrines reſpecting Ireland, of the late Mr. Edmund Burke and his diſciples: whether it is either reaſonable, juſt, or expedient, to confer ſuch privileges on Iriſh Romaniſts, after ſo many maſſacres and rebellions, and particularly immediately after their recent maſſacre and rebellion, which has been very partially and inadequately puniſhed; and which merits vengeance, not honourable reward: and finally, whether ſuch arguments as are advanced by Lord Minto, if perſiſted in and further urged, may not be the ſources of infinite calamity to both countries.

I will take my leave of Lord Minto and his Speech, by obſerving, that his Lordſhip in ſome parts, particularly in thoſe relating to the animoſities reſulting from difference of Religion in Ireland, ſeems to defert his uſual caution, and to ſpeak in a ſtrain of dictation to Iriſh Proteſtants not very conciliating; intimating an abject dependance of the Iriſh nation on Great Britain, pretty much in the ſtyle of a very arbitrary maſter to his ſlave; his Lordſhip's prudence will, I am ſure, prevent ſuch errors from creeping into any of his future publications. He alſo diſtinguiſhes Iriſh Proteſtants and Romaniſts by the title of

different

different caſts; and ſtates, 'that every one knows the firm 'and immovable baſis on which their mutual hatred 'ſtands, the irreconcilable nature of its motives, its 'bitter, malignant, and implacable character.' His Lordſhip ought to have been ſomewhat better acquainted with the Iriſh nation, before he ventured to give the aforeſaid deſcription of it. His information reſpecting Ireland ſeems to be very imperfect in other particulars, as well as in the foregoing. In the great Eaſt Indian Peninſula, the natives, who are but ſlaves to the Moors, are divided into ſeveral claſſes, by Europeans called *caſts*; they are all of the ſame Religion, that of Brama; and theſe caſts never intermarry with each other, or intermix in any way, or even eat together. Their Religion teaches them to preſerve themſelves perfectly ſeparate and diſtinct the one caſt from the other, and ſo they have continued for ages. No ſuch ſeparation or diſtinction ever took place in Ireland between Proteſtants and Romaniſts: they intermarry with each other, and live together, very frequently in amity and concord, as friends and neighbours. Romaniſts frequently conform to the Proteſtant Religion, and there is ſcarce a family of any note in Ireland which has not relatives of both Religions. Many families of the middle rank are much mixed. Proteſtant men have Romiſh wives, and Proteſtant women Romiſh huſbands; and very often, in ſuch caſes, the progeny, male and female, has been educated in different perſuaſions; the males following the Religion of the father, the females that of the mother. Romaniſts, when acting in a body as a political party, are very different in their conduct from that which they purſue in private life. The unalterable principles of benevolence which the Almighty has implanted in the breaſts of mankind, as ſocial creatures,

tures, exerts its natural influence on Iriſh Romaniſts, when diſengaged from the leading principles of their ſect conſidered as a faction: it guides them to the exerciſe of the uſual offices of neighbours and friends, to thoſe of a different religious perſuaſion. When they act in a body, and are actuated by the principles of their ſect, *ſuch as they are taught in the Lateran Council*, they have often acted with the greateſt barbarity, and committed the moſt inhuman maſſacres on their Proteſtant neighbours, relations, and friends; tearing aſunder then all the ties of blood, and violating all the duties of friendſhip; and ſuch effects of their religious principles make them the more dangerous as a body, inaſmuch as they extinguiſh all the ſocial feelings in the breaſts of a claſs of men as amply endowed by Nature with the ſocial qualities and virtues as any other. The Religion of Proteſtants teaches them no ſuch inhuman doctrines: they therefore, as a political body, entertain no ſuch deteſtable opinions. They are willing to treat, and have always treated, their Romiſh fellow-ſubjects, as a body, with every degree of indulgence and kindneſs, which is, or can be conſiſtent with their own ſafety and protection; and in private life they have always been ready to extend to, and receive from Romaniſts, every kind of ſocial, friendly, and neighbourly offices. His Lordſhip is ſomewhat incorrect, if not offenſive, in applying the diſtinction of *different caſts* to Iriſh Proteſtants and Romaniſts; thereby evidently meaning to degrade both the one and the other, by levelling them with the enſlaved, ignorant, pagan natives of Hindoſtan. He is alſo groſsly miſtaken in repreſenting the hatred which Iriſh Romaniſts, as a body and a faction, manifeſt againſt their Proteſtant countrymen, as *mutual*. Iriſh Proteſtants entertain no

ſuch

ſuch hatred of their Romiſh fellow-ſubjects, nor did they ever diſcover any ſymptoms of ſuch hatred. They have never adopted any deliberate meaſure of hoſtility againſt their Romiſh countrymen, which was not demanded by the imperious calls of ſelf-defence and protection; and his Lordſhip might have ſpared ſo unwarranted a reflection, as well as others of the ſame kind, on Iriſh Proteſtants. They are indeed well convinced that Iriſh Romaniſts, when they act as a political body, do entertain a hatred of Iriſh Proteſtants, the motives of which are of an irreconcilable nature, and its character bitter, malignant, and implacable, becauſe they are taught by the principles of their Religion to entertain it; but the Proteſtant Religion inculcates no ſuch principles.

I have now ſo fully expoſed the miſrepreſentations of the Political State of Ireland in the Engliſh publications reſpecting the relative numbers, wealth, and power, and the rights and claims, of Proteſtants and Romaniſts; the civil diſſenſions and Rebellions which have taken place in that nation ſince the Reformation, and the cauſes of them; that it is not neceſſary to advert to other modern Engliſh publications on the ſame ſubject; becauſe the miſrepreſentations contained in them are all of the ſame nature with thoſe I have already expoſed. But there is one pamphlet lately publiſhed, entitled, '*Subſtance of the Speech of the Right Honour-*'*able Lord Sheffield, Monday, April 22d,* 1799, *upon* '*the Subject of Union with Ireland*;' one paragraph of which I ſhall here take notice of; it is to be found in page 43, and is as follows: 'The objection to Union 'on the part of the Proteſtants of Ireland is unac-'countable. They can hardly be ſaid to conſtitute a

'nation;

'nation; they are an Engliſh Colony governing upwards 'of three millions of Roman Catholics, or at leaſt ſix 'times their own number, in a country acquired and 'maintained by Engliſh arms and treaſure; which Co-'lony never could have ſupported itſelf, and even the 'laſt ſummer would have been overwhelmed, unleſs 'protected by the ſame means, by Engliſh power.' Every perſon who has read the preceding pages of this tract, will be convinced that every line of this paragraph contains a groſs miſrepreſentation, highly offenſive to every Proteſtant inhabitant of Ireland, and little calculated to promote an Union, the profeſſed object of the Speech. This miſrepreſentation, I am convinced, is entirely and juſtly attributable to Burkiſm, and miſinformation conveyed to the noble Speaker by the followers of that ſect; his well-known character ſetting him high above all ſuſpicion of any other motive. I have already ſhown that Iriſh Proteſtants cannot be conſidered as an Engliſh Colony, when oppoſed to Iriſh Romaniſts. The diſtinction of Coloniſt and Native has been long ſince worn out; and if the origin of the race of Iriſh inhabitants is to be traced by their ſurnames, the inhabitants of native Iriſh extraction compoſe a very large proportion of Iriſh Proteſtants, and thoſe of native Engliſh extraction a ſtill greater proportion of Iriſh Romaniſts. His Lordſhip is egregiouſly miſtaken in his calculation of the relative numbers of Iriſh Proteſtants and Romaniſts. (See Appendix, No. 1.) The Romiſh Convention calculated the relative numbers as three to one: his Lordſhip has doubled the proportion! Property is on the ſide of the Iriſh Proteſtants as thirty-nine to one; they have therefore, though the ſmaller number, a right to govern the greater, by the principles of the Britiſh Conſtitution.

ſtitution. Ireland is an acquiſition to the Britiſh Crown, made by Henry the Second, not by the expenditure of blood and treaſure, but by the conſent of the natives. If the Engliſh Crown has been obliged to employ its arms and expend its treaſure in the ſuppreſſion of ſubſequent Rebellions, the loyal inhabitants of Ireland have always aſſiſted with their arms and treaſure, and the Engliſh nation has been fully repaid by the retention of its ſiſter kingdom as part of the Britiſh Empire, without which it could ſcarcely ſubſiſt in an independent ſtate, at leaſt in the preſent ſituation of Europe. His Lordſhip is alſo under a great error, when he ſtates that Ireland is a country maintained by Britiſh arms and treaſure; and that Iriſh Proteſtants, whom he calls a Colony, could never ſupport themſelves without Britiſh arms and treaſure, and that they would have been overwhelmed in the ſummer of 1798, had they not been protected by Engliſh power: for Ireland ſupports herſelf by her own arms and treaſure, and the Iriſh Proteſtants are well able to maintain themſelves againſt any efforts of Iriſh Romaniſts by their own arms and treaſure; and demonſtrated ſuch their ability in the ſuppreſſion of the Romiſh Rebellion in the ſummer of 1798, without any Britiſh aſſiſtance. Lord Cornwallis came over to Ireland for the purpoſe of extending pardon to the Iriſh Rebels, already routed and diſperſed, and for defending the country from a foreign invaſion; and if the Britiſh nation ſent aſſiſtance to part of the Britiſh Empire, invaded or threatened with an invaſion by the French, with whom the Empire is at war, was the part aſſiſted under any greater obligation for that aſſiſtance than the part which did not ſtand in need of ſuch aſſiſtance? Is not Ireland engaged in the preſent war with France

merely becauſe ſhe is a part of the Britiſh Empire? And is ſhe not entitled to aſſiſtance from the other parts of the Empire, when menaced with an invaſion by the common enemy? She is not equal by herſelf to combat with France, neither are the other parts of the Empire taken ſeparately: they muſt combat the common enemy with the common force of the whole. It gives me great pain to be obliged thus to animadvert on theſe unfounded aſſertions which his Lordſhip has been deceived into the riſking. How very ridiculous would the aſſertion be, that the Normans ſettled in England are now French Coloniſts! The man would be looked upon as inſane, who ſhould argue, that theſe Coloniſts, compared with the native Saxons and Britons, were only as one to ſix, and that therefore this Colony ſhould agree to an Incorporating Union with France. Yet ſuch argument would be as good as his Lordſhip's; for the Normans ſettled in England only one century earlier than the Engliſh ſettled in Ireland; and the Normans may more juſtly be ſaid to have ſettled in England by conqueſt, than the Engliſh in Ireland. William, previous to his ſettlement in England, defeated the Saxon Monarch in a great and deciſive battle. Henry the Second acquired Ireland without a blow. In truth, all ſuch arguments are highly abſurd. Different nations inhabiting the ſame territory for ſeven hundred years, as the Saxons and Normans; for ſix hundred years, as the Engliſh and Iriſh; under the ſame Government and Laws, muſt be ſo blended and mixed together, as to become one and the ſame nation: otherwiſe the inhabitants of the different diſtricts of the habitable world might be ſaid to be compoſed of different nations reſpectively, and the diſtinctions of different races ſubſiſt in the ſame country for ever. I muſt here obſerve,

ſerve, that publications, purporting to be Speeches ſpoken in the Britiſh Parliament, reſpecting Iriſh affairs, as well by the Members in Oppoſition as by ſome of His Majeſty's Miniſters and their friends, have had very bad effects in Ireland, and have been among the moſt prominent cauſes of the laſt Rebellion; holding out ſtrong encouragements to Iriſh Romaniſts, and as it were ſtimulating them to inſurrection, and inſpiring them with the moſt flattering hope of ſucceſs. It is ſincerely to be wiſhed, that at leaſt the friends of Government in England were more circumſpect and diſcreet in their aſſertions and poſitions reſpecting the ſtate of Ireland, and ſomewhat better informed, before they venture to ſend abroad to the public, crude and ill-digeſted plans of projected innovations in that kingdom, and raſh and ill-founded opinions concerning the political influence and power of the different claſſes of its inhabitants.

In the pamphlet entitled '*Arguments for and againſt* '*an Union between Great Britain and Ireland conſidered*,' written, as generally reported, by an Engliſh Gentleman in a confidential office under the Government in Ireland, the following points, among others, are ſtated as propoſed to be eſtabliſhed by an Union: '*An Arrangement* '*for the Roman Catholic Clergy*, ſo as to put an end, if 'poſſible, to religious jealouſies, and to enſure the at-'tachment of that order of men to the State.—*An Ar-*'*rangement with reſpect to Tithes*.' And in page 30 of that excellent pamphlet entitled '*The Speech of the Right* '*Honourable William Pitt in the Britiſh Houſe of Com-*'*mons*,' there is a paſſage which has given no ſmall cauſe of alarm to Iriſh Proteſtants: the cauſes of complaint of Iriſh Romaniſts are therein ſtyled *moſt*

goading and oppreſſive; and the paſſage proceeds,—'with 'reſpect to the grievances of which the lower orders of 'the Catholics of Ireland complain, I do not at preſent 'purpoſe entering into the detail of the means which 'may be found to alleviate their diſtreſſes, *nor how far* 'it is poſſible to give them relief on the ſubject of Tithes, 'or put it into their power to make a proviſion for the Clergy 'of their own Church.' Connecting this paſſage with the two points ſuggeſted by the above-mentioned pamphlet, it would ſeem that the Britiſh Miniſtry had come to a reſolution to give a national ſupport to the Romiſh Iriſh Clergy, and that this ſupport is to be extracted from that of the Parochial Proteſtant Clergy of Ireland, to wit, *the Tithes*, by aſſigning a portion of them to the Romiſh Clergy. I have already ſhown, that no part of the Tithes is really and *bonâ fide* paid out of the property of the Peaſantry, but out of that of their Landlords; and that forty-nine parts out of fifty of the landed eſtates belong to Proteſtants, and conſequently that forty-nine parts out of fifty of the Tithes are really paid out of the property of Proteſtants. I have ſhown, that the Iriſh Proteſtant Clergy are not paid by the Romiſh Peaſantry in general, more than one fifth part of the real value of the Tithes, though an abatement is made out of the rents of their farms nearly equal to the real value of them; ſo that the Peaſantry really gain, inſtead of loſing, by the lands being ſubject to Tithes. Is it therefore conſiſtent with juſtice, leaving civil policy out of the queſtion, to compel Iriſh Proteſtant Landlords to ſupport Romiſh Prieſts for inſtructing their Tenantry in principles hoſtile, not only to the State, but to their perſonal ſafety individually? And is it reaſonable that ſuch ſupport ſhould be ſubtracted from the ſubſiſtence of the Proteſtant Parochial

rochial Clergy, already ſufficiently ſcanty? It muſt be obſerved here, that the Romiſh Pariſh Prieſts have in general a comfortable ſubſiſtence: they can afford to live as well as the great majority of the beneficed Proteſtant Clergy of Ireland. I have already ſhown the poor proviſion which is made for them; and the Curates of the eſtabliſhed Church are in a worſe ſituation, in point of ſubſiſtence, than the great majority of Romiſh Prieſts; nor is there at preſent any great proſpect of materially bettering their condition; the narrow circumſtances and ſcanty proviſion of the majority of the beneficed Clergy rendering any conſiderable increaſe of the ſtipends of Curates in general impracticable. The Proteſtant Clergy are moſtly married men, and have families to ſupport: the Romiſh Prieſts are bound to celibacy. I have already ſhown, that Romiſh Prieſts, from certain doctrines and ceremonies of their Religion, have ways and means of extracting money from thoſe of their perſuaſion, which the Proteſtant Clergy have not. The former, throughout Europe, are complete adepts in the ſcience of religious alchemy. A Romiſh Prieſt can procure a ſubſiſtence from a congregation of Romaniſts, when a Proteſtant Clergyman, with a congregation of Proteſtants equally numerous and wealthy, if bereft of Tithes, would ſtarve. It is further to be conſidered, that the diſaffection of the Romiſh Clergy, as well as Laity, ariſes from the principles of their Religion; and that it admits of no other cure than the change of theſe principles. Were the Romiſh Clergy in poſſeſſion of the whole revenues of the Proteſtant Church Eſtabliſhment in Ireland, it would not render them a whit leſs hoſtile to the Proteſtant Government. No argument for conferring on them a proviſion from the State can be deduced from the ſup-

poſition, *that the attachment of that order of men would be thereby enſured to the State.* Their hoſtility would in ſuch caſe remain unchanged : their ability to exerciſe it more effectually would be increaſed. The Gentleman who has propoſed this expedient, has, if I am rightly informed, documents in his poſſeſſion ſufficient to demonſtrate that the Romiſh Prieſts throughout the kingdom were very active agents in the late Rebellion : many of them appeared openly in arms, and were generally the moſt blood-thirſty of the Inſurgents. It is not a little ſurpriſing to obſerve, that a ſcheme for conferring public rewards and eſtabliſhments on vanquiſhed, yet irreclaimable Rebels, who ſo recently imbrued their hands in the blood of their loyal fellow-ſubjects, at the expenſe, and extracted from the pockets, of the ſurviving ſufferers, ſhould be propoſed as one of the conditions of an Incorporating Union of Great Britain and Ireland! And it is to be hoped that ſuch ſcheme will be finally reprobated by the magnanimous Britiſh Miniſter, and by every Proteſtant in Great Britain and Ireland ; and that no new arrangements reſpecting Tithes will be introduced in Ireland, except ſuch as ſhall be adopted in England ; and that the eſtabliſhed Clergy of both kingdoms may be kept on the ſame footing. That great Miniſter, who may with propriety be ſtyled the Atlas of Europe, is ſo fully engaged in buſineſs of the greateſt moment to the Chriſtian world, that he has not always ſufficient leiſure to examine minutely all the circumſtances which muſt be conſidered in the progreſs of a Treaty of Union. His great and comprehenſive mind entertains the general plan on an enlarged ſcale of public utility ; but he will not diſdain to receive information from inferior underſtandings on points of moment, relating to the rights of

conſiderable

conſiderable bodies of men, whoſe agency materially contributes to the exiſtence of ſociety, and whoſe ſecurity muſt be provided for in the treaty,—rights on which he may have yet caſt but a tranſient glance, as a man ſurveying a region from a high mountain, views, with but little attention, inferior eminences.

I cannot help expreſſing my regret, that the ſpirit of Burkiſm, which has notoriouſly poſſeſſed ſome men of great power in England, ſeems to have made its way to the Britiſh Miniſter, ſo as to convey to him ſome very falſe information reſpecting Iriſh affairs. His ſtyling the cauſes of complaint of Iriſh Romaniſts *moſt goading and oppreſſive*, convinces me that ſome impreſſions have been made upon him, not at all favourable to the true intereſts, not only of Iriſh, but of Engliſh Proteſtants. I cannot comprehend what *goading or oppreſſive cauſe of complaint* Iriſh Romaniſts labour under. They are on an exact level with Iriſh Proteſtants in the equal enjoyment of all civil privileges, except the capacity of ſitting in Parliament and filling a few public offices, in whoſe department is lodged the Supreme Executive Power of the State. And how are they incapacitated? By their refuſal to take the oaths and engagements for the ſecurity of the State, taken by all His Majeſty's ſubjects who ſit in Parliament or fill ſuch offices. This incapacity is the only cauſe of complaint of Iriſh Romaniſts; and Engliſh Romaniſts have the very ſame cauſe of complaint. Is this a cauſe of complaint *moſt goading and oppreſſive?* Are the proviſions of the Engliſh Act of the firſt of Elizabeth, of the Bill of Rights, the 1ſt of William and Mary, of the Teſt and Corporation Acts, of the 30th of Charles the Second, of the 1ſt of George the

Firſt, of the Act ratifying the Articles of Union of England and Scotland, of all the ſimilar Acts in Ireland, all already mentioned, goading and oppreſſive? I am convinced Mr. Pitt never intended to throw ſuch a reflection, ſuch a cenſure, on theſe Acts, allowed by all our ableſt writers, and by all who are not Romaniſts or Jacobins, to be the bulwarks of the Conſtitution. I confeſs myſelf utterly unable to gueſs the meaning of the paſſage I have quoted, and would acknowledge great obligations to any perſon who would be kind enough to explain it to me.

I think this no improper place to give a ſhort deſcription, for the information of Engliſh Proteſtants, of the *magnificent ſeminary for the excluſive education of Romiſh Prieſts*, lately founded and eſtabliſhed in Ireland *by the ſole influence of the Engliſh Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, always the Iriſh Prime Miniſter.*

In the ſeſſion of the Iriſh Parliament of the year 1795, a Bill was introduced by the Secretary into the Houſe of Commons, entitled, 'An Act for the better Education of Perſons profeſſing the Popiſh or Roman Catholic Religion.' This Act empowered certain truſtees, therein named, to receive donations for eſtabliſhing and endowing an academy, for the education of perſons profeſſing the Roman Catholic Religion, and to acquire lands exempt from forfeiture by mortmain, not exceeding the yearly value of one thouſand pounds: and a clauſe was introduced at the end of it, for giving theſe truſtees the ſum of eight thouſand pounds, out of the public money, as an aid to the undertaking. This Bill paſſed through the Houſe, and was enacted into a

law,

law, without oppoſition, and with little notice or diſcuſſion. The Secretary repreſented, that it was more the intereſt of the State to permit Romaniſts to found a ſeminary for the education of their youth at home, than, by refuſing ſuch permiſſion, to incline them to ſend them abroad to foreign Romiſh ſeminaries; and that it was becoming the liberality of the nation to give them ſome aid towards the inſtitution. Theſe repreſentations were plauſible, and no Member of either Houſe thought it a matter of ſufficient importance to warrant an oppoſition, ſuppoſing the Romaniſts were to complete the buſineſs at their own coſts; and that Parliament would hear no more of it. Mr. Huſſey, already mentioned, a Romiſh Prieſt educated in Spain, and imported into Ireland during the ſhort Lieutenancy of Earl Fitzwilliam, was, by the influence of the Secretary, appointed Preſident of the Seminary: this man has been ſince appointed Biſhop of Waterford, as he aſſerts, by the Pope, and has made himſelf very remarkable in Ireland, by the publication of a moſt inflammatory ſeditious pamphlet, under the title of a Paſtoral Letter. The projectors of this ſcheme of a Romiſh Seminary, however, were determined not to let the Iriſh Parliament off on ſuch cheap terms: the *Engliſh Secretary*, though a very honourable worthy man, ſeemed in every particular to be a ſtaunch Burkiſt, or at leaſt to be under the dominion of that ſect of politicians; and, being the oſtenſible founder of the Seminary, he reſolved it ſhould not be left for its ſupport to the caſual benevolence of Iriſh Romaniſts, for whoſe uſe it was founded; he procured the payment to the truſtees of large ſums of money out of the public purſe, amounting in the whole to near forty thouſand pounds.

In

In every ſubſequent ſeſſion, a regular charge of eight thouſand pounds was made to Parliament for its annual ſupport. The magnitude of this ſum, for ſuch a purpoſe, ſtartled ſome of the Members of both Houſes, and regular accounts and items of the eſtabliſhment and expenditure were called for: and it appeared in the ſeſſion of 1798, that not one penny had ever been received by the truſtees, from any Romaniſt as a donation: that the eſtabliſhment was for the excluſive education of two hundred ſtudents in Divinity only, as a ſource to furniſh a perpetual ſupply of *two thouſand Romiſh Prieſts to the Kingdom*: that each of theſe ſtudents was to be entertained in the Seminary for four years, and then prieſted, and ſent abroad as an officiating Clergyman: that the annual ſum of eight thouſand pounds was required for the maintenance of them and their teachers; that is, theſe two hundred ſtudents were to be educated at an annual expenſe of forty pounds per head to the nation: that none of the Romiſh laity were to be admitted as ſtudents into this Seminary; which is neither more nor leſs than a moſt magnificent Romiſh Monaſtery, erected, and to be ſupported, by the Iriſh Proteſtant Parliament, within eleven miles of the city of Dublin, for the *ſapient* purpoſe of training a perpetual body of two thouſand miſſionaries to be diſperſed through the nation, to propagate ſyſtematic doctrinal diſaffection to the eſtabliſhed Government in Church and State. Many Members of both Houſes expreſſed their diſlike of this inſtitution; they did not fail to ſtate to the Miniſter, that Parliament had been led into an acquieſcence with the meaſure in its infancy, by great cunning and addreſs; that the Bill, under the ſhade of which this noxious and unconſtitutional weed had ſprung up, did

not

not warrant ſo dangerous an innovation; that it only empowered Iriſh Romaniſts to found a Seminary at their own expenſe, for the education of their youth in general; yet this was a Seminary founded, and to be ſupported, at the expenſe of the nation, for the excluſive education of Romiſh Prieſts: that it was evident the Romiſh Laity did not deſire nor want ſuch a Seminary, for they never had ſubſcribed a ſhilling to its ſupport; and the Univerſity of Dublin had been opened to them for the education of their youth, by the Bill of 1793, in their favour. The Engliſh Secretary argued for the expediency of the inſtitution, principally, almoſt entirely, *on the neceſſity, as he alledged, of a ſupply of Romiſh Prieſts for the nation:* he ſtated, that the Seminaries for the education of the Romiſh Prieſts in France and Flanders, had been deſtroyed by the Jacobins; that Romiſh Prieſts required an education different from that of their Laity; and that therefore this Seminary was properly appropriated to the excluſive education of Romiſh Prieſts. Many Members of the Houſe could not comprehend the force of this argument: they could not underſtand how the deſtruction of Seminaries for the education of Romiſh Prieſts in Flanders or France, made it imperative on the State to provide for the education of a ſet of men, in principles of Religion, not only different from that of the State, but hoſtile to it; and for the purpoſe of diffuſing it. They conceived the deſtruction of ſuch Seminaries to be advantageous to the State; the eſtabliſhment of ſimilar ones in their own country, for the ſame purpoſe, highly pernicious. They could not comprehend the public utility of educating Romiſh youth, deſtined for the Miniſtry, in different ſchools from the lay youth of that perſuaſion: they knew it to

be

be an old policy in the Court of Rome, to ſeparate the Clergy from the Laity, in all concerns relating to private life, as much as poſſible; that it might attach the Clergy in all countries to its own particular intereſt: but they could not comprehend the neceſſity of their ſupporting ſuch a political ſyſtem. The Miniſter was very hard puſhed in the year 1798, in carrying the grant of eight thouſand pounds to his Monaſtery through the Houſe; many of his moſt attached friends deſerted, and left the Houſe during the debate; he was obliged to ſend out his emiſſaries to rally his ſcattered troops; and he carried it at laſt by a reluctant majority in a very thin Houſe, few more than forty Members being preſent. In the laſt ſeſſion of the Iriſh Parliament, the new Miniſter introduced a Bill in the Houſe of Commons, for a grant of a ſomething leſs ſum than eight thouſand pounds to this Monaſtery; it paſſed the Houſe, and went up to the Lords, where it was thrown out. It appeared on this occaſion, that ſixty-nine ſtudents only, inſtead of two hundred, were maintained in the houſe, notwithſtanding the charge for the ſupport of the full number was but little diminiſhed. It was currently reported, and very generally believed, that about thirty-ſix Romiſh ſtudents from this Monaſtery, had, on the breaking out of the Rebellion, joined the Inſurgents, and fought at Kilcock and other places againſt the King's troops. Certain it is, that ſixteen or ſeventeen have been expelled from it on account of the Rebellion; but the Governors waited with *becoming prudence*, till the Rebellion was ſuppreſſed, before they executed this act of wholeſome ſeverity. Some of theſe rebellious ſtudents had been ſlain in action, and others had fled to eſcape puniſhment. Previous to the breaking out of the Rebellion,

bellion, a viſitation had been held in Trinity College, Dublin, and ſeventeen ſtudents, all Romaniſts, except three or four reputed Proteſtants, to the beſt of my recollection, had been expelled by the Viſitors; it being proved, that they had been ſeduced into that abominable traitorous aſſociation, called the Society of United Iriſhmen: one of the reputed Proteſtants was a brother of Mr. Emmet, a Member of the Iriſh Directory, now impriſoned at Fort George in Scotland. From what appeared before the Viſitors, it was pretty evident, that Romaniſts had reſorted to that College, particularly the ſons of a leading Romiſh democrat, heretofore a very active Member of the Romiſh Convention in Dublin, for the ſole purpoſe of diffuſing the poiſon, and propagating the doctrines, of the United Iriſhmen through the College; and that the contagion was ſtopped in time, by the ſpirit and exertions of the Proteſtant ſtudents, through whoſe intervention the Viſitors were called on for the exertion of their authority, to purge the College of ſuch peſtilent corruptions. When the new Miniſter found his Bill, for the grant of ſo large a ſum of money to the Romiſh Seminary, was rejected by the Houſe of Lords, he attempted to introduce another Bill for the ſame purpoſe, into the Houſe of Commons; but this was rejected, conformably to the eſtabliſhed uſage of the Houſe, which forbids the introduction of a new Bill, for the ſame purpoſe with a rejected one, in the ſame ſeſſion. The new Miniſter, on the introduction of his ſecond Bill, thought fit to advert to the viſitation which had been held eight months before in the College of Dublin; and extolling, very juſtly, the conduct of one of the Viſitors (without condeſcending to take the ſmalleſt notice of the conduct of the other, who had in every parti-

cular concurred with his colleague), he took occaſion to acquaint the Houſe, that the College of Dublin had been infected with the poiſon of treaſon; without any reaſon, viſible to the generality of the Members, for the introduction of the viſitation or the infection of the College of Dublin into his ſpeech; with any part of which they had no apparent connexion: he alſo pathetically lamented the miſcarriage of his Bill in the Houſe of Lords; and particularly ſtated, *that Government would not let ſo uſeful an inſtitution, as that of the Romiſh Monaſtery, fall to decay, for want of ſufficient ſupport.* I perfectly underſtood the Iriſh Miniſter's reaſon for introducing into his ſpeech the viſitation of the College of Dublin, and its infection: he feared the objections which might be made to the Romiſh Monaſtery, on the ſcore of treaſon, and determined to obviate them, by ſtating that the Proteſtant College of Dublin had alſo been infected. But he omitted to ſtate, that almoſt all the ſtudents expelled from the College of Dublin were Romaniſts, or had been ſhortly before ſo; and that the infection had been introduced by them: that the College of Dublin had near ſeven hundred ſtudents, ſeventeen only of whom were expelled, and that they were dragged to the viſitatorial tribunal by the Proteſtant ſtudents: that the great maſs of the ſtudents of Trinity College, Dublin, were eminently loyal: and that the Romiſh Monaſtery, whoſe ſtudents were ſecluded from the world, and therefore leſs liable to external infection, had but ſixty-nine ſtudents, ſeventeen of whom were expelled for actual Rebellion, excluſive of thoſe who were killed in action, or fled from the gallows. I never could diſcover the utility of the inſtitution, as ſtated by the Miniſter; nor do I ſufficiently underſtand, how Government can

apply

apply any part of the public treaſure to its ſupport, not only without the concurrence of Parliament, but contrary to its deciſion, by the rejection of the Bill for that purpoſe: I thought the Treaſury was better guarded, than to admit of ſuch an arbitrary diſpoſition of any part of its contents. The annual income for the ſupport of the Univerſity of Dublin does not amount to eight thouſand pounds. A large part of this ariſes from private donations, the remainder from grants of the Crown of its own eſtates, and no part of it from Parliamentary grants of ſums to be raiſed by taxes aſſeſſed on the ſubject. The monſtrous proviſion required for the education and ſubſiſtence of two hundred Romiſh ſtudents, all paupers, will be more clearly underſtood, when I compare it with that which is provided for poor ſcholars in Trinity College, Dublin, moſt of whom are deſtined to the Proteſtant Miniſtry in Ireland. There are thirty fizers in the College of Dublin; theſe poor gentlemen have no proviſion whatſoever from the College, ſave their dinners, of the broken meat from the table of the fellows: they are obliged to provide their own chambers: there are ſeventy-two ſcholars of the houſe, thirty of whom enjoy what are called Natives' Places; the Natives have each a ſalary of twenty pounds per annum, and their dinners: the remaining forty-two ſcholars have four pounds per annum, and their dinners: they are both obliged to provide their own chambers. A ſcholarſhip is not attainable till the ſtudent is of two or three years ſtanding, a Native's place not until he is of four: and both expire when the ſtudent attains the ſtanding of a Maſter of Arts. The Romiſh poor ſcholars in the Monaſtery are magnificently lodged *gratis*, and maintained at a great expenſe in a

moſt plentiful manner: there is a proviſion for two hundred. How different are the eſtabliſhments for the education of the Proteſtant and Romiſh Clergy in Ireland! And how infinitely ſuperior is that of the latter claſs! This is one, and a very glaring effect of the ſpirit of Burkiſm, diffuſed among our rulers both in Great Britain and Ireland. There is no ſuch magnificent foundation, in any College of the two famous Univerſities of Oxford and Cambridge, for the education and ſubſiſtence of poor, or any ſtudents, as is made in this Romiſh Monaſtery, for the education and ſubſiſtence of theſe embryos of Romiſh Prieſts, deſtined for the propagation of doctrinal principles through the realm, ſubverſive of the Conſtitution in Church and State!

I am now come to the laſt obſervation I ſhall make on the melancholy effects of the ſpirit of Burkiſm in the Britiſh Councils: I ſhould indeed have been willing to omit it, from my reſpect to the great Perſonage, whoſe conduct I muſt neceſſarily advert to; but the tranſaction I am about to ſtate, has become ſo public, and is of itſelf of ſo extraordinary a nature, ſo demonſtrative of the deceptions practiſed in England by Mr. Burke's diſciples, and the miſinformation reſpecting the ſtate of Ireland, which they find means to convey to great Miniſters of State, and obtain credit for; that it cannot be omitted in a Tract, written with a view of opening the eyes of the Britiſh nation, and expoſing to it the dangerous arts of the profeſſors of Burkiſm, and the deplorable effects they are capable of producing.

The

The county of Wexford, in which the late Rebellion burſt out, ſuddenly and unexpectedly, with aſtoniſhing rapidity and fury, lies on the ſea-coaſt oppoſite to Pembrokeſhire in South Wales; it is almoſt entirely compriſed in the dioceſe of Ferns. The Rebels in two days made themſelves maſters of almoſt the whole county, and particularly of the inland parts. I have already ſtated part of the barbarous maſſacres they committed on the Proteſtant inhabitants of that county in cold blood; and particularly their ſlaughter of all the Proteſtant Clergy who fell into their hands. At the firſt exploſion, a few Proteſtant Clergymen, and other Proteſtant inhabitants, living near the ſea-coaſt, finding their retreat into the country cut off, and hearing of the indiſcriminate murder of all Proteſtants by the Rebels, hopeleſs of mercy, fled to the coaſt, threw themſelves into the firſt boats they met with, almoſt all ſmall yawls and ſkiffs, undecked, and furniſhed only with oars, and committed themſelves to the waves of a very boiſterous ſea, to eſcape from their mercileſs purſuers. The Almighty God preſerved the lives of theſe perſecuted wanderers; they croſſed the Channel ſafely, and landed in Pembrokeſhire, with no other ſuſtenance than what was contained in their pockets; and no clothes, but what they wore on their perſons; and made their way to the town of Haverford Weſt, deſtitute of all means of ſubſiſtence. Mr. John Colclough of Tintern Abbey, on the ſea-coaſt of the county of Wexford, the ſecond ſon of a reſpectable family in the county, and nephew to Mr. Cornelius Grogan, who acted in the capacity of Commiſſary General to the Rebel army, having a ſtout veſſel of his own, put to ſea on the breaking out of the Rebellion, and landed in Pembroke-

ſhire, together with one Thomas M'Cord or M'Leard, a clerk whom he employed in a flour-mill, and they both repaired to the town of Haverford Weſt. It appears by the Report of the Secret Committee of the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, that Mr. Colclough and his clerk were ſuſpected to have been very active in promoting the Rebellion. (See Appendix to that Report, No. 35.) However, whether the ſuſpicion was juſt or not, neither the one nor the other choſe to join the Inſurgents; for they quitted the country on the commencement of the Rebellion. Mr. Colclough was at the head of his family intereſt (his eldeſt brother being abſent on the Continent), which was very conſiderable, and gave him a great influence among the lower orders in the county, particularly the Romiſh peaſantry; and he might have been of great ſervice in curbing the Rebellion, had he remained in the country, and been willing to exert himſelf in that reſpect: and he could have remained in the country with greater ſafety than other gentlemen, as well on account of his family influence, as that of his uncle, a Rebel General, and a man of great property. The Magiſtracy and inhabitants of Haverford Weſt received the unfortunate fugitives with great charity and hoſpitality: they made ſubſcriptions for their relief and ſupport until they could procure ſupplies for their ſubſiſtence from Ireland. Meſſ. Jordan and Bowen, Magiſtrates of Haverford Weſt, wrote an account of the arrival of theſe ſufferers in their town, to his Grace the Duke of Portland, His Majeſty's Secretary of State for the Home Department, and probably ſolicited relief for them: to this application of theſe Magiſtrates, his Grace was pleaſed to return the following anſwer: which I here inſert,

inſert, as it was publiſhed in the Dublin Journal, and ſeveral other Newſpapers. It bears date the 22d of June 1798:

'GENTLEMEN,

'I have received your letter on the ſubject of the late influx of perſons in your county from Ireland, and am extremely ſorry to obſerve that there are ſo many *young Clergymen and able-bodied men* among them. The conduct of ſuch perſons in remaining out of Ireland at a moment like the preſent, is very much to be cenſured; and I deſire that you will uſe your beſt endeavours to impreſs them with a due ſenſe of the dangerous tendency of ſuch an example, and of the diſhonourable and diſgraceful imputations to which it obviouſly expoſes themſelves: and at the ſame time that you will make known to the Clergy, *that their names will certainly be reported to their reſpective dioceſans*. With reſpect to *Mr. Colclough, and Mr. M'Cord*, I deſire that they may have full liberty, either to go to Ireland, or to ſtay in the country; *and that all perſons for whom they will anſwer*, as well as all the infirm men, women, and children, may be admitted to the ſame indulgence.

'I am, Gentlemen,

'Your moſt obedient humble ſervant,

'*Whitehall, June 22d*, 1798. PORTLAND.

'*To Meſſrs. Jordan and Bowen, at Haverford Weſt.*'

The county and the town of Wexford were reſcued from the Rebels, about the time of the date of the Duke's letter. They were chaſed from them with conſiderable

ſlaughter: the Proteſtant Gentlemen of the county were ſummoned to a general meeting in the town of Wexford on the 7th of July 1798, by General Lake. A copy of the Duke's letter was laid before them; they were all ſtruck with amazement: and they determined unanimouſly to ſend a letter to the Duke on the ſubject, of which the following is a copy: it was ſigned by the High Sheriff of the county:

'The Committee of Gentlemen of the county of 'Wexford, appointed by General Lake, having read a 'copy of a letter from his Grace the Duke of Portland 'to Meſſrs. Bowen and Jordan, Magiſtrates in the town 'of Haverford Weſt, South Wales, dated 22d June, ult. 'and which appears to have been in anſwer to a letter 'received by his Grace from thoſe Gentlemen, cannot 'avoid teſtifying their hearty ſorrow at the cenſure thrown 'upon the Clergy of their dioceſe in ſaid letter, and their 'indignation at the groſs miſrepreſentation which muſt 'have occaſioned it. They are unanimous in a high 'opinion of the loyalty, patriotiſm, and proper conduct 'of the Clergy, and ſtrongly feel the neceſſity of their 'flight and abſence during the continuance of the Rebellion which ſo unhappily raged in this county; as, had 'they not effected their eſcape, they have every reaſon to 'conclude that they would have ſhared a ſimilar fate with 'thoſe unhappy few of that body, who early fell into the 'hands of the Inſurgents, and were afterwards maſſacred 'in cold blood.

'They lament, that men of ſuch unblemiſhed cha'racter and conduct, ſhould, from the ſecret repreſenta'tions of perſons no way qualified, be proſcribed that

'protection

'protection and aſylum ſo liberally beſtowed on the per-
'ſons of *Mr. John Colclough* and *Thomas M'Cord*, men
'who were, and might have remained in perfect ſecurity
'in His Majeſty's fort at Duncannon, and whoſe cha-
'racters are by no means free from imputation in this
'country, and on whom they are ſorry to find ſuch favour
'laviſhed by the *Engliſh Cabinet*, as they are certain no
'favourable account of their conduct could be made to
'Government ſave by themſelves.

'EDWARD PERCIVALL,

'Sheriff, and Chairman of the Committee.

'*Wexford, July 7th*, 1798.

'*To his Grace the Duke of Portland, Whitehall.*'

To this letter, though written in the names of a great number of the moſt reſpectable Gentlemen in the county, and ſigned by the High Sheriff, his Grace, as I am informed, never condeſcended to return any anſwer.

The following paragraph was inſerted in the Waterford Newſpaper of July the 10th, 1798:

'Yeſterday Mr. John Colclough of Tintern Caſtle,
'county of Wexford, was brought here from Milford, in
'cuſtody of two King's meſſengers; he was eſcorted by
'a party of the Union cavalry to Thomas Town on his
'way to Dublin. Mr. M'Cord, who was implicated in
'the charge for which the former was apprehended, had
'made off, but it is ſaid that there was no probability of
'his avoiding the vigilance of his purſuers. *Theſe are*
'*the two Gentlemen who were ſpoken ſo favourably of, in a*

'*letter from the Duke of Portland to Meſſrs. Jordan and*
'*Bowen at Haverford Weſt.*

'CLERICUS WEXFORDIENSIS.'

His Grace the Duke of Portland is the chief of the family of Bentinck in England, which is originally Dutch; his Grace's anceſtor was the great favourite of King William the Third, our glorious deliverer from Popery, Slavery, and arbitrary Power: he accompanied that great Prince to England, and received from him moſt bountiful rewards for his ſervices, and moſt laviſh marks of his favour. His Grace owes all his honours, all his great eſtates, to the Revolution of 1688; he enjoys, and holds them, if I may ſo ſay, by a Proteſtant tenure. His Grace is univerſally eſteemed a Nobleman of great benevolence, and amply endowed with the ſocial virtues. At the time he wrote this letter to the Magiſtrates of Haverford Weſt, he was, as he now is, His Majeſty's principal Secretary of State for the Home Department; and conſequently ought to have been well informed on points relating to the internal ſtate, as well of Ireland, as of Great Britain. To what cauſe then can the writing of ſuch a letter by his Grace, ſo unmeritedly reflecting on the conduct of Proteſtant Clergymen, be attributed? *Proteſtant Clergymen* in the moſt diſtreſſed ſituation that men could be reduced to! obliged to beg from ſtrangers a morſel of bread, and a ſpot to lay their wearied limbs in! a letter proſcribing all relief to *Proteſtant Clergymen*, obliged to fly, naked and deſtitute, from their homes, in open boats acroſs the ſea, and to brave all the perils of the deep, to eſcape from the ruthleſs daggers of infuriate Romiſh aſſaſſins; that relief which was ſo liberally and charitably afforded to *French Romiſh Prieſts* in ſimilar circumſtances! a letter enjoining their

Proteſtant

Proteſtant fellow-ſubjects to ſpurn *Proteſtant Clergymen* flying from maſſacre, and imploring protection, with contempt and reprobation from their doors! The cauſe is to be found in the indefatigable exertions of the diſciples of the late Mr. Edmund Burke, and of himſelf whilſt living, in infuſing the poiſon of his Romiſh principles into the minds of his Grace, and of other great men in England: miſrepreſenting, traducing, and vilifying with unwearied and unceaſing application, the whole Proteſtant ſyſtem in Ireland. How powerful muſt the influence of Burkiſm be, when it could load the mild and benevolent diſpoſition of his Grace with ſo uncharitable a bias! I have been for fifteen years laſt paſt Vicar General of the dioceſe of Ferns; I have therefore an opportunity of being well acquainted with the Clergy of it; and I never yet knew a ſet of men more orthodox, more pious, more charitable, more eſteemed by their Proteſtant pariſhioners, and, as was generally ſuppoſed, by their Romiſh pariſhioners too, till the late Rebellion ſet fire to the mine of their irreclaimable hoſtility to what they are taught to repute Hereſy. The Wexford Clergy were almoſt all reſident in their reſpective pariſhes, and were regular in the diſcharge of their duty. But my teſtimony of their irreproachable and meritorious conduct is of very little conſequence, when weighed with that of the great body of the Proteſtant Gentlemen of the county, their pariſhioners, and their attached friends, from a due ſenſe and experience of their merits. His Grace's unwarrantable reflections on the conduct of the poor, diſtreſſed, deſpoiled, and exiled Proteſtant Clergy of Wexford in his letter, are not more wonderful, than his favourable recommendation of Meſſrs. Colclough and M'Cord to the Magiſtrates of Haverford Weſt. Surely if the conduct of

the Clergy, in flying from their country in a ſeaſon of Rebellion, was reprehenſible; that of theſe two perſonages, particularly of the firſt, in abandoning their country at ſo critical a period, deſerved infinitely more the cenſure of his Grace. They were both young men able to fight in defence of their lives and properties; and Mr. Colclough could have been of great ſervice in extinguiſhing the flames of Rebellion in a very conſiderable part of the county of Wexford, had he been inclined to exert himſelf for that purpoſe; and they could both have remained at home with much leſs hazard to their perſons or properties, than the Proteſtant Clergy. His Grace's favour to theſe two men muſt have ariſen from the ſame ſource with his reprobation of the conduct of the Wexford Clergy. And I do preſume moſt humbly to ſuggeſt to his Grace, the juſtice and propriety of reviewing his own conduct on this occaſion; and examining into the ſources of that miſinformation, which led his Grace to adopt a proceeding ſo oppoſite to the general operations of his Grace's humanity, ſo very diſtreſſing to the innocent and oppreſſed objects of his Grace's cenſure, and ſo grating to the feelings of every loyal Proteſtant ſubject of the Britiſh Empire.

I will conclude with expreſſing a wiſh, that the influence of *Burkiſm* may receive an effectual and timely check, as well in Great Britain as in Ireland: and that all diſgraceful and pitiful intrigues with an Iriſh Romiſh faction, in itſelf utterly inefficient, either for the promotion or obſtruction of an Incorporating Union of the two nations, and highly offenſive to the loyal Proteſtant ſubjects of His Majeſty in Ireland, may be ſpeedily and for ever abandoned: and that the patronage by Britiſh

Stateſmen

Stateſmen of ſuch miſchievous, deſperate projects as Lord Minto's, which, if at all practicable, would be ſubverſive of the Conſtitution in Church and State, in both countries, may not be made a powerful objection to that moſt effective of all meaſures, which can be ever propoſed for the aggrandizement of the Britiſh Empire, and the mutual benefit of both countries—an INCORPORATING UNION.

PATRICK DUIGENAN.

Dublin, September 20th, 1799.

P. S. MY original deſign was, to preſent to the Britiſh Miniſtry, and to the Engliſh nation in general, a fair and juſt picture of the Preſent Political State of Ireland; which ſeems to have, for ſome time paſt, been expoſed to their view in very falſe and deceptive colours. I conceived that ſuch a performanee might be of uſe in the arrangement of meaſures, which muſt precede and introduce an Incorporating Union of the two nations. I am a man attached to no party, unleſs my ſteady adherence to the principles of the Conſtitution of the Britiſh Empire in Church and State, be conſidered as attachment to a party. I am neither placed nor penſioned, but I am a loyal Proteſtant ſubject of His Majeſty. I have explicitly expreſſed my *opinion* reſpecting an Incorporating Union, though I have offered no *arguments* on the queſtion, as it has been already fully canvaſſed in many able publications both in England and Ireland; amongſt which, I particularly recommend to the peruſal of ſuch as are deſirous of good information on the ſubject, two pamphlets: the one con-

taining '*The Speech of William Smith, Esq. on the Debate of* '*the Queſtion of Union in the Iriſh Houſe of Commons*,' particularly that part of it which relates to the Competency of Parliament: the other, the ſame Gentleman's '*Review*' of the pamphlet containing '*The Speech of the Right Ho-*'*nourable the Speaker of the Iriſh Houſe of Commons*:' infinitely the moſt formidable adverſary of an Union, and one of the ableſt men in Ireland. Theſe two pamphlets I look upon as capital performances. In the latter, the author, who is a young man, has combated with great vigour the arguments of the well-informed veteran politician.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

No. 1.

Calculation of the Number of Inhabitants in Ireland.

SIR WILLIAM PETTY ſurveyed the whole kingdom of Ireland with amazing accuracy (as may be ſeen by his Map preſerved in the Surveyor-general's office), ſhortly before the Reſtoration in 1660, by order of the then Iriſh Government. In his 'Political Anatomy' he ſtates the whole population of Ireland in 1672, ſixteen years antecedent to the commencement of the Revolution war, to amount to one million one hundred thouſand.

Dean Swift, in his ſecond Drapier's Letter, publiſhed in 1724, ſtates, that the inhabitants of Ireland, by the largeſt computation, then amounted to one million and a half only.

In 1732, an enumeration of the inhabitants of Ireland was made by order of Government, and they were found to be under two millions.

Mr. Buſhe, a Member of the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, has given an account of the number of houſes in Ireland, calculated

calculated from the hearth-money books in 1791; with other documents for enumerating the inhabitants of Ireland.

Mr. Chalmers, from the documents furniſhed by Mr. Buſhe, calculates the number of inhabitants of Ireland in 1791 to amount to four millions two hundred thouſand; and from thence deduces, that they have been nearly quadrupled in the courſe of one hundred years ſince the Revolution. (See 'Chalmers's Eſtimate,' page 222, 223.)

With this laſt calculation I cannot agree, for the following reaſons:

1ſt. Mr. Chalmers, who has taken great pains to aſcertain the population of England and Wales, computes that population at the time of the Revolution to have amounted to nearly ſeven millions (Eſtimate, page 58); and the population in the year 1794 to amount to nearly eight millions and a half (Eſtimate, page 220): and conſequently, that England and Wales have increaſed in population only one million and a half in one hundred years. In his quotation from Mr. Wallace it is laid down, that the diſtreſſed circumſtances of mankind diſabling them to provide for a family, check very greatly the increaſe of population (Eſtimate, page 221): and he ſtates, that when England was a country of ſhepherds and warriors, ſhe was inconſiderable in numbers; that when manufacturers found their way into the country, when huſbandmen gradually acquired greater ſkill, and when the ſpirit of commerce at length actuated all, people, as it were, grew out of the earth, amidſt convulſions, famine, and warfare; that England can ſcarcely be regarded as a manufacturing

and

and commercial country at the Revolution, when contraſted with her preſent proſperity in manufacture and trade. (Eſtimate, page 212, 213.) Ireland, during the whole period from the Revolution to the preſent day, when manufactures and commerce are little more than in their dawn, that dawn itſelf only commencing in the year 1782, when the ſhackles on her commerce were taken off, may be ſaid to have been a country of ſhepherds and warriors. The whole kingdom, part of the province of Ulſter excepted, in which the linen manufacture has for ſome years flouriſhed (and which alſo has been doubled in the laſt ten years), being almoſt deſtitute of agriculture and manufactures, and inhabited chiefly by herdſmen; a peaſantry, as poor and miſerable as any in Europe, for want of employment, and always furniſhing the armies of foreign Potentates, as well as thoſe of Great Britain, with multitudes of ſoldiers, and all foreign nations, particularly America, with crowds of emigrants: England, at the ſame time, conſtantly increaſing in manufactures and commerce, and her people ſo fully employed, that the nation has frequently complained of want of hands to execute the various works in which they were engaged. From all which, I think it not only improbable, but impoſſible, that Ireland can have quadrupled her population ſince the Revolution, and that England and Wales ſhould not, in the ſame ſpace of time, have increaſed their population even by a fourth part.

2dly. I think the calculation made by Mr. Chalmers, from the documents afforded by Mr. Buſhe, of the numbers in each houſe, is too great; in particular, the calculation of ſix perſons to a houſe of one hearth: not more than four, if ſo many, ſhould be allowed. The inhabitants

inhabitants of ſuch houſes cannot be ſuppoſed to maintain ſervants; they conſiſt of a man, his wife, and children, when fully inhabited; often of widows and children. The Iriſh inhabitants of ſuch houſes ſend off their children as ſervants or labourers the moment they are able to gain any kind of ſubſiſtence, their extreme poverty diſabling them to maintain a family.

3dly. I am inclined to think that there is ſome error in the calculation of the number of houſes in the nation, and that they do not amount to ſo many as Mr. Buſhe has computed them to be.

4thly, and laſtly. The ſuperficial contents of the iſland of Great Britain are to thoſe of Ireland in the proportion of three and a half to one. I conjecture, from the inſpection of the maps, that the ſuperficial contents of Scotland, with its iſlands, are pretty much the ſame with thoſe of Ireland, perhaps they a little exceed them: England and Wales muſt be therefore more than twice as large as Ireland. I appeal to every intelligent man who has travelled over the two nations, whether the local population of England and Wales be not vaſtly greater than that of Ireland. If England and Wales have mountains and waſtes, Ireland has her mountains, waſtes, bogs, lakes, and moraſſes, of much greater extent, comparatively ſpeaking, than England and Wales; and in the inhabited parts of the two nations the populouſneſs of England and Wales exceeds that of Ireland in a very great ratio. I fancy Mr. Chalmers, whoſe reſearches, accuracy, and judgment, do him infinite honour, never travelled through Ireland, particularly through the provinces of Connaught, Munſter, and Leinſter; if he had, he never

never could have been induced to believe that Ireland contained upwards of four millions of inhabitants, and England and Wales only double that number. One thing I will venture to aſſert, either that the calculation of the number of inhabitants of England and Wales falls vaſtly ſhort of the real number, or that the number of the inhabitants of Ireland is groſsly exaggerated: and that if Ireland contains upwards of four millions of inhabitants, England and Wales contain at leaſt twelve millions. I have a much better opinion of the accuracy of Mr. Chalmers's calculations, and the authenticity of his documents, than of thoſe of Mr. Buſhe; and am myſelf decidedly of opinion, that the number of the inhabitants of Ireland has been exaggerated; and particularly, becauſe I have known it to be a cuſtom in Ireland, for gentlemen, who have aſſumed the title of Patriots, conſtantly to exaggerate the ſtrength and importance of Ireland, with a view of bearding Great Britain; and they have, in the faſhion of Falſtaff, increaſed *their men in buckram* by upwards of one million, in my own recollection. A ſort of inferior Member of this claſs of politicians, and an United Iriſhman, lately publiſhed a pamphlet in Dublin, relating to the health of the Citizens, and means of preſerving it, in which he aſſerts, tranſiently as it were, that the inhabitants of Dublin amount to four hundred thouſand, though I never before heard them computed at a greater number than one hundred and fifty thouſand, and they are certainly under two hundred thouſand. I am myſelf of opinion that the whole inhabitants of Ireland do not amount to more than three millions, if to ſo many.

Relative Numbers of Proteſtants and Romaniſts in Ireland.

Sir William Petty, in his 'Political Anatomy,' ſtates the proportion of Proteſtants and Romaniſts in Ireland to be as three to eight, in the year 1672, ſixteen years before the Revolution, ſo that at that time the Iriſh Proteſtants amounted to more than one third of the inhabitants of the country. In the year 1732, an accurate enumeration was made by order of Government of all the families in Ireland, diſtinguiſhing the Proteſtant families from the Romiſh in each Province, and a calculation was made from thence of the numbers of the Proteſtant and Romiſh inhabitants of Ireland: it was printed in Dublin in the year 1736, and reprinted in 1788. It appears from that calculation, that in the year 1732 the number of Proteſtant inhabitants was to that of the Romiſh in the proportion of one to two and a half. Dr. Burke, Romiſh titular Biſhop of Oſſory, wrote a book in Latin, which he entitled, 'Hibernia Dominicana;' it was printed at Bruſſels in the year 1762; and he particularly ſtates, that an actual enumeration was made of the numbers of Proteſtants and Romaniſts in Ireland in the year 1731, and that there were found to be then in the kingdom ſeven hundred thouſand four hundred and fifty-three Proteſtants; and one million three hundred and nine thouſand ſeven hundred and ſixty-eight Romaniſts: ſo that the proportion of Romaniſts and Proteſtants was not in the year 1731 quite two to one, according to Dr. Burke. It is very likely that this Romiſh Biſhop had very accurate information of the relative numbers, perhaps better than that which could be deduced from the documents ſtated in the pamphlet containing the calculation made in 1732. Dr. Burke alſo ſtates, that the proportion had much increaſed

on

on the Proteſtant ſide, between the year 1731 and the year 1762, when he wrote, by the operation of the Popery Code, and the Proteſtant Charter-ſchools, and makes grievous complaints of the increaſe of Heretics, as he ſtyles Proteſtants. The Popery Code continued in full vigour till the year 1776, and its operation, together with the Charter-ſchools, muſt have increaſed the proportion on the Proteſtant ſide. There is a modern document which muſt have great weight in this queſtion, taken from the numbers of beggars admitted into the Houſe of Induſtry in Dublin, for a courſe of ſix years, beginning with the year 1784, and ending with the year 1789; and their reſpective religious perſuaſions.

This Houſe of Induſtry is a general receptacle for all beggars which flock into Dublin from all parts of Ireland, for there are no poor rates in Ireland. Divine ſervice is performed ſeparately in this receptacle for perſons of the two perſuaſions, and chaplains are retained for each by the Corporation.

Numbers admitted.

	Proteſtants.	Romaniſts.
In 1784 —	696 —	1870
In 1785 —	768 —	2435
In 1786 —	1794 —	2912
In 1787 —	1493 —	3341
In 1788 —	854 —	3643
In 1789 —	798 —	3615
Sum total	6403	17,816

The Romiſh beggars admitted during a courſe of ſix years, did not exceed the Proteſtant beggars in the proportion of three to one. The Houſe of Induſtry is filled

with the loweſt claſs; and as the property in the hands of Iriſh Proteſtants is to that in the hands of Iriſh Romaniſts as thirty-nine to one, the proportion of beggars on the ſide of Iriſh Romaniſts to thoſe on the Proteſtant ſide, muſt vaſtly exceed the proportion of Romaniſts and Proteſtants in the nation at large. Beſides, although wandering beggars flock to Dublin from all parts of the kingdom, the feweſt certainly come from the northern counties, which abound moſt with Proteſtants; for having a flouriſhing manufacture, theſe counties ſend forth feweſt beggars. From all theſe documents it may be fairly concluded, that Iriſh Romaniſts exceed Iriſh Proteſtants in number throughout the whole kingdom in no greater proportion than that of two to one, perhaps in a much leſs.

The Romiſh Convention in Dublin, in the year 1792, firſt broached the poſitions, that Iriſh Romaniſts exceeded Iriſh Proteſtants in the proportion of three to one, and that the groſs number of the inhabitants amounted to four millions; conſequently, that the Romaniſts amounted to three millions. They never produced any document on which they pretended to found a calculation; however, they then admitted that Iriſh Proteſtants amounted to one million. It is remarkable that this Convention never ſcrupled to advance and publiſh any falſehood whatſoever, which they thought might be of advantage to their cauſe; of which their petition to His Majeſty is a very prominent inſtance.

Comparative Property of Iriſh Proteſtants and Romaniſts.

The firſt reaſonable ground of calculation of the comparative property of Iriſh Proteſtants and Romaniſts,

muſt be taken from the quantity of landed eſtates in the hands of the members of each perſuaſion reſpectively; and this is the ſureſt ground of calculation in a country like Ireland, which is only juſt beginning to be a commercial country, and has as yet made no great progreſs. To make a true eſtimate in this reſpect, we muſt go back to the time of James the Firſt. In his reign, ſix whole counties, out of nine contained in the province of Ulſter, were forfeited to the Crown for treaſon: the King granted a great part of theſe counties to Engliſh and Scotch Proteſtants. Theſe grants made a great addition to the landed eſtates at that time in the hands of Proteſtants; and the Grantees being infinitely more induſtrious than the former poſſeſſors, ſuch of the ancient inhabitants as retained their eſtates by the favour of the Crown, in theſe ſix counties, and the ſame claſs throughout the whole province of Ulſter, being a barbarous race, unuſed to induſtry, and addicted to luxury and gluttony, particularly to an immoderate thirſt for ſtrong liquors, waſted their properties, contracted large debts, and ſold great portions of their eſtates to their induſtrious and frugal Proteſtant neighbours in that province, before the great Iriſh Rebellion in 1641. Their poverty, the conſequence of their own idleneſs and diſſipation, and their envy of the proſperity of their Proteſtant neighbours, the fruit of their frugality and induſtry, are aſſigned as ſome of the cauſes of that horrid Rebellion and Maſſacre. The whole maſs of Iriſh Romaniſts throughout the nation engaged in this Rebellion of 1641; and when it was at length ſuppreſſed, almoſt the whole of the landed eſtates in the hands of Iriſh Romaniſts, at the time of its commencement, were forfeited to the Crown, and parcelled out among Proteſtants. Theſe forfeitures, with

the landed eſtates in the hands of Proteſtants at the commencement of the Rebellion, amounted to five ſixths of the whole landed property of the nation. The Iriſh Romaniſts in a maſs again rebelled in the year 1699. After a war which laſted three years with uncommon fury, they were ſubdued; but obtained conditions, by which they were at liberty to remain in Ireland, and retain their eſtates, on the terms of their ſubmiſſion to the new Government under King William and Queen Mary, and taking the Oath of Allegiance; or of tranſporting themſelves to France, and relinquiſhing their eſtates as forfeitures. Almoſt the whole body of Romaniſts then entitled to eſtates in Ireland, choſe rather to go to France and abandon their eſtates, than ſubmit to the Government and take the Oath of Allegiance. They entertained ſtrong hopes of a new revolution in their favour, in which they were diſappointed. The eſtates thus abandoned to forfeiture were granted by the Crown to Proteſtants. By the ſeveral means before mentioned, almoſt the whole landed property in Ireland became veſted in Proteſtants. That part of the Popery Code which prohibited Iriſh Romaniſts to acquire landed property was enacted in the ſecond year of Queen Anne (1703), ſhortly after the Revolution. It was afterwards ſtrengthened by the eighth of Anne (1709), and was not materially relaxed, ſo as to allow them to purchaſe eſtates in fee, till the year 1782. In all the intermediate ſpace, being eighty years, Romaniſts had the liberty of alienating the ſmall pittance of landed property which remained in their hands after the Revolution, which they did not fail to make a liberal uſe of; but no liberty of acquiſition: and during the eighteen years laſt paſt, they have had neither property, time, nor opportunity

to

to purchaſe or acquire any conſiderable portion of landed eſtates, ſo as materially or ſenſibly to diminiſh the maſs of landed property in the hands of Iriſh Proteſtants at large. And from all the cauſes before mentioned it is certain, that the allowance of one fiftieth part of the landed property of the nation to the ſhare of Iriſh Romaniſts, at the preſent day, is rather too great.

The ſmall proportion of perſonal property in the hands of Iriſh Romaniſts, when compared with that in the poſſeſſion of Iriſh Proteſtants, may be eſtimated from the following facts: About ſixteen years ago, when a national Bank was eſtabliſhed in Ireland, the capital propoſed was ſix hundred thouſand pounds. The Iriſh Romaniſts ſubſcribed as much of this capital as they could raiſe, with a hope of engroſſing to themſelves the whole direction of the Bank, and thereby gaining a powerful influence to their party; yet the whole body was not then able to ſubſcribe a larger part of this capital than ſixty thouſand pounds, one tenth of it! One argument ſtrongly relied upon for the propriety of repealing that part of the Popery Code which forbad the acquiſition of landed eſtates by Romaniſts, and that which had moſt weight with many Members of Parliament in that tranſaction, was, that if Romaniſts were allowed to buy eſtates, the rates of purchaſe of lands would be doubled, from the vaſt number of Romiſh buyers (repreſented as poſſeſſed of great perſonal property), which would then flock into the land market. They have had liberty to purchaſe eſtates theſe eighteen years paſt. When they obtained that liberty, fee-ſimple eſtates in Ireland, though leaſed to tenants for long terms of years, and conſequently not likely to increaſe in value, were ſold at the

rate of from twenty-three to twenty-five years purchaſe: at preſent they do not bring a greater price than eighteen years purchaſe; and they have been gradually ſinking in value from the time the Romaniſts obtained the permiſſion to purchaſe; a demonſtration, that the number of purchaſers in the land market did not much increaſe by that permiſſion, and that the perſonal riches of Iriſh Romaniſts were imaginary. Since the free trade was granted to Ireland in the year 1782, ſome Iriſh Romaniſts have acquired conſiderable fortunes in trade; but ſeveral Iriſh Proteſtants have alſo acquired large fortunes in the ſame time, by the ſame means; ſo that it is pretty clear, that the perſonal eſtates of Iriſh Romaniſts, in the maſs, do not amount to more than the twentieth part of the perſonal property of the nation, if to ſo much.

It is proper here to inſert an account of a very extraordinary and artful attempt at procuring a fraudulent and garbled enumeration of the numbers of Proteſtants and Romaniſts in Ireland, and giving it a credit and authenticity; which was made in the year 1795, and which ought to put Iriſh Proteſtants on their guard, and render them more vigilant in defeating ſuch attempts for the future.

In the year 1786, a ſociety was formed in Ireland, and incorporated by patent, ſtyled the Royal Iriſh Academy. A great number of the firſt characters in the kingdom in rank and property are members of this Academy; Lords, Privy Counſellors, Biſhops, and diſtinguiſhed Commoners. It is of the ſame nature with the Royal Society in England. It has been inſtituted for the advancement of the ſtudies of Science, Polite Literature, and

and Antiquities. As ſocieties formed on the Continent, nominally for ſimilar purpoſes, were perverted into engines for the ſubverſion of the reſpective Governments under which they were eſtabliſhed, one of which was the Society of Economiſts in France; and as the juſtly admired, celebrated, and learned Author of the '*Purſuits* '*of Literature*' has hinted, that attempts have been made to diſtort ſome of the publications of the Royal Society in London to political and factious purpoſes, by ſome buſy Romaniſts, under the veil of gratifying public curioſity by reſearches into antiquities; ſo ſome of the moſt factious of the Romaniſts of Ireland, and deſperate Jacobins their allies, ſoon directed their attention to this Society, and endeavoured, with too much ſucceſs, to get themſelves admitted members of it; and I have read with amazement the names of Dr. M'Nevin, and others of rather worſe and more dangerous characters, in the liſt of the members of this Society. It is an obſervation of Dean Swift, that men of ability often, from a liſtleſs inactivity, reſign their pretenſions to *vigilant dunces, who are ſure never to be out of the way.* A ſimilar obſervation is applicable to men of great rank and character in ſocieties ſuch as I am adverting to. From buſineſs, from inattention, and other cauſes, they are frequently found almoſt to abandon the meetings of theſe ſocieties, and reſign the management of them to *vigilant Jacobins, who are ſure never to abſent themſelves;* giving them thus an opportunity of perverting the profeſſed purpoſes of ſuch ſocieties to their own factious plans and deſigns, and ſtamping their frauds with the credit of great names. Thus it has happened in this Society. Dr. Prieſtley, as well as I recollect, coined the word Statiſtical. He was deſirous of ſubverting the Conſtitution in Church and State, and

with that view endeavoured to encourage all Diſſenters to enter into a general confederacy for the purpoſe, and proceeded in the execution of that ſcheme, by ſelecting ſuch parts of England as abounded moſt with them, and numbering the inhabitants, with the different modes of their religious worſhip, to ſhow that the number of inhabitants of the eſtabliſhed Religion was not equal to that of Diſſenters of all denominations. For this purpoſe he put forward what he called *Statiſtical* Inquiries in particular places, ſuch as Birmingham, &c.; and to give an importance to his ſeditious operations, and to diſguiſe them as the mere ſpeculative purſuits of a philoſopher, he coined the quaint term *Statiſtical*; a *Statiſtical Inquiry*, in the vulgar tongue, ſignifying nothing more than an *Inquiry into the State*. This mode of inquiry has been taken up ſince in England by a reſpectable Baronet, I believe for laudable purpoſes. The Romaniſts and Jacobins in the Royal Iriſh Academy procured a Committee of Statiſtical Inquiry to be appointed by the Society (the Members probably of their own nomination), for the enumeration of the inhabitants of Ireland, diſtinguiſhing the religious perſuaſion of each perſon. A Form was printed by this Committee, in columns, directing the mode in which the returns of the number, religion, and occupations of the inhabitants of each pariſh, barony, county, and dioceſe in the kingdom, was to be made; and by the printed Form it appears, that the whole was to have been executed by the Romiſh Pariſh Prieſts throughout the kingdom. When the Romiſh Prieſt of each pariſh had fabricated his ſtatiſtical account of the numbers, religion, and occupation of the inhabitants of his pariſh, he was to ſhow it (if he thought fit) to the Proteſtant or Diſſenting Miniſter of

the pariſh, and requeſt his ſignature. This Committee well knew, that not one Proteſtant Miniſter in one hundred would ſign ſuch an account, made up by the Romiſh Prieſt. The printed Form alſo contained a Reſolution of this Committee, to apply to the Romiſh titular Biſhops, requeſting their aſſiſtance in making this ſtatiſtical inquiry, and the Copy of a Letter to be written by them reſpectively to each of their ſubordinate Prieſts. The Committee managed the whole buſineſs in the Society.

This was a ſcheme equally fraudulent and dangerous, calculated by the original projector or projectors for the mere purpoſe of ſapping the Proteſtant intereſt in Ireland. The Committee for Statiſtical Inquiries paſſed over the Proteſtant Miniſters, and ſelected the Romiſh Prieſts throughout the kingdom, to make this inquiry, well knowing that they would make returns in the ſame ſpirit with Huſſey, titular Biſhop of Waterford, who ſtated, in a ſeditious pamphlet publiſhed by him, that Iriſh Romaniſts exceeded Iriſh Proteſtants in the kingdom at large, in the proportion of ten to one; and in that of one hundred to one in the dioceſe of Waterford: A moſt impudent falſehood! The Proteſtants, as appears by the printed Form, were to be ſubdivided by the Romiſh Prieſts into different ſects, ſuch as Proteſtants, Preſbyterians, Quakers, Methodiſts, &c. ſo as to make the numbers of each ſect, when compared with the Romaniſts, appear in a diminiſhed ratio; and to withdraw the attention of thoſe, into whoſe hands the publication of the reſult of the ſtatiſtical inquiry ſhould come, from the ſum total of the Proteſtants, and to fix it on the aggregate exaggerated number of Romaniſts; though, as Romaniſts conſider all who are not of their communion

to

to be Heretics, and are equal enemies to them all, in comparing the relative numbers of Iriſh Proteſtants and Romaniſts, all perſons who are not Romaniſts, are juſtly to be accounted on the Proteſtant ſide; it being equally the intereſt of them all to oppoſe the perſecuting ſpirit of Popery, the common enemy. The time of inſtituting this inquiry is worthy of remark. The Reſolution of the Committee to employ the Romiſh Prieſts in the buſineſs, in the printed Form in my poſſeſſion, bears date June 20th, 1795, the very time when the Romaniſts throughout the kingdom were buſily employed in preparing for a general Inſurrection, and, as they ſtyled it, organizing their army; and the reſult of ſuch an inquiry made by the Romiſh Prieſts throughout the nation, but publiſhed under the ſanction and authority of ſo reſpectable a body as the Royal Iriſh Academy, as a mere philoſophical tranſaction, detached from all ſuſpicion of party intrigue, the projectors knew would give mighty encouragement to the Inſurrection, by the falſe and inflated account of the numbers and ſtrength of Iriſh Romaniſts, when compared with the dwarfiſh repreſentation of their opponents, which they knew would be contained in it. This would add to the confidence of the Rebels, and depreſs the ſpirits of the loyal inhabitants. The projectors alſo knew, that ſuch a fraudulent inquiry would have a ſtrong effect in Great Britain in their favour, in the event either of the ſucceſs or ſuppreſſion of the Rebellion.

It is not generally known how far this inquiry has been proceeded on; but this is certain, that, antecedent to the Rebellion, ſeveral perſons who joined in it, and ſome of whom were ſlain in the progreſs of it, others hanged

hanged on its ſuppreſſion, and ſome who have been acquitted on trials for treaſon by the proviſions of the Amneſty Bill, were very active in making the inquiry, and proceeded on it under the form preſcribed by the Committee for Statiſtical Inquiry. Perhaps the reſpectable Members of the Society have been awakened from their ſlumbers by the dangerous and fraudulent tendency of the meaſure, and have defeated the project.

No. 2.

Extract from the Iriſh Act of the 33d of His preſent Majeſty (1793), *entitled,* '*An Act for the Relief of His* '*Majeſty's Popiſh or Roman Catholic Subjects of Ire-*' *land.*'

Sect. IX.

PROVIDED always, and be it enacted, That nothing herein contained ſhall extend, or be conſtrued to extend, to enable any perſon to ſit or vote in either Houſe of Parliament, or to hold, exerciſe, or enjoy the office of Lord Lieutenant, Lord Deputy, or other chief Governor or Governors of this kingdom; Lord High Chancellor, or Keeper, or Commiſſioner of the Great Seal of this Kingdom; Lord High Treaſurer, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Chief Juſtice of the Court of King's Bench or Common Pleas, Lord Chief Baron of the Court of Exchequer, Juſtice of the Court of King's Bench or Common Pleas, or Baron of the Court of Exchequer, Judge of the High Court of Admiralty, Maſter or Keeper of the Rolls, Secretary of State, Keeper of

of the Privy Seal, Vice-treaſurer, Teller or Caſhier of the Exchequer, or Auditor General, Lieutenant or Governor, or Cuſtos Rotulorum of Counties, Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, Lord Deputy, or other chief Governor or Governors of this Kingdom, Member of His Majeſty's moſt honourable Privy Council, Prime Serjeant, Attorney General, Solicitor General, Second and Third Serjeants at Law, or King's Counſel, Maſters in Chancery, Provoſt or Fellow of the College of the Holy and Undivided Trinity of Queen Elizabeth near Dublin, Poſtmaſter-general, Maſter and Lieutenant-general of His Majeſty's Ordnance, Commander in Chief of His Majeſty's Forces, Generals on the Staff, and Sheriffs and Sub-ſheriffs of any County in this Kingdom, or any office contrary to the rules, orders, and directions made and eſtabliſhed by the Lord Lieutenant and Council, in purſuance of the Act paſſed in the 17th and 18th years of the reign of King Charles the Second, entitled, *An Act for explaining ſome Doubts ariſing upon an Act, entitled, 'An Act for the better Execution of His Majeſty's gracious 'Declaration for the Settlement of his Kingdom of Ireland, 'and Satisfaction of the ſeveral Intereſts of Adventurers, Sol-'diers, and other his Subjects there;' and for making ſome Alterations of, and Additions unto, the ſaid Act, for the more ſpeedy and effectual Settlement of this Kingdom*; unleſs he ſhall have taken, made, and ſubſcribed the oaths and declarations, and performed the ſeveral requiſites, which by any law heretofore made, and now of force, are required, to enable any perſon to ſit or vote, or to hold, exerciſe, and enjoy the ſaid offices reſpectively.

No.

No. 3.

Extract from Blackſtone's Commentaries, 4th vol. page 57, Octavo Edition.

THE better to ſecure the eſtabliſhed Church againſt perils from Non-conformiſts of all denominations, Infidels, Turks, Jews, Heretics, Papiſts, and Sectaries, *there are two bulwarks erected, called the Corporation and Teſt Acts.* By the former of which no perſon can be legally elected to any office relating to the government of any city or corporation, unleſs, within a twelvemonth before, he has received the ſacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the rites of the church of England; and he is enjoined to take the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, at the ſame time that he takes the Oath of Office; or in default of either of theſe requiſites, his election ſhall be void. The other, called the *Teſt Act*, directs all Officers, civil and military, to take the Oaths, and make the Declaration againſt Tranſubſtantiation, in the Court of King's Bench or Chancery, the next term, or at the next quarter-ſeſſions, or within ſix months after their admiſſion; and alſo within the ſame time to receive the ſacrament of the Lord's Supper, according to the uſage of the Church of England, in ſome public church, immediately after divine ſervice and ſermon, and to deliver into Court a certificate thereof, ſigned by the Miniſter and Churchwardens; and alſo to prove the ſame by two credible witneſſes, upon forfeiture of 500*l.* and diſability to hold the office.

P. S. Teſt Act paſſed in the 13th of Charles II. c. 1.
Corporation Act in the 25th of Charles II. c. 2.

END OF PART II.

An Entire New Domeſtic Medicine.

BUCHAN's DOMESTIC MEDICINE,

Conſiderably Enlarged and Improved,

Illuſtrated with Elegant Copper Plates.

This Day is Publiſhed, No. I. Price only 1s. Embelliſhed with an Elegant Frontiſpiece, and another Copper Plate properly adapted to the Subject, (the Whole to be completed in only Fourteen Numbers, including all the Improvements, Additions, and Alterations) of

The New Domeſtic Medicine:

Or, Univerſal Family Phyſician.

Containing a complete treatiſe on the prevention and cure of *Diſeaſes* by Regimen and Simple Medicines. With an Appendix, containing a Diſpenſatory for the uſe of private Practitioners.

To which are now added, Obſervations on the Diet of the Common People; recommending a Method of living leſs expenſive, and more conducive to Health, than the preſent.

A New Edition, Enlarged, Corrected, and Improved,

By GEORGE WALLIS, M. D.

Of Red-Lion-Square, London.

This new and improved edition being juſt printed off and thoroughly completed in only fourteen numbers, may be had by one or more at a time (price 1s. each) at the option of purchaſers.

As this is abſolutely the moſt correct and improved edition and the beſt book on the ſubject ever publiſhed—the public are requeſted (in order to prevent miſtakes or impoſition) to give poſitive orders for

Dr. *Wallis's* New Domeſtic Medicine, or, Buchan Improved and Illuſtrated.

Illuſtrated with Elegant Copper Plates, and

Printed only for Alex. Hogg, in Paternoſter-Row, London.

PART III.

THE

SPEECH

OF

PATRICK DUIGENAN, L.L.D.

IN THE

IRISH HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, FEB. 5, 1800,

ON THE

SUBJECT

OF AN

INCORPORATING UNION

BETWEEN

GREAT-BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

SPEECH,

&c. &c. &c.

I AM unwilling to give my vote in support of a measure of such importance, as the consolidation of the realms of Great-Britain and Ireland by an Incorporating Union, without explaining to my countrymen the reasons which have influenced me to contribute my weak assistance to so momentous a measure. I shall endeavour to compress them into as small a compass as possible: premising, however, that I feel no inconsiderable portion of dissatisfaction and regret, in perceiving that my sentiments on this occasion are

different from those of many able men, as remarkable for their public spirit, as for integrity, extent and strength of talents, natural and acquired, and with whose political opinions, since I took any part in public business, I have heretofore generally concurred. I confess that I feel some consolation in observing, that I differ also in opinion, on the present business, from other Gentlemen, with whose political opinions I never did nor ever will concur; and that although there is a division among the loyal and staunch friends of the Constitution on the present question, yet there is an entire coincidence of opinion upon it among all Jacobin traitors throughout the kingdom: they, to a man, are hostile to it; their principles I abhor: and I cannot refrain from expressing my uneasiness at perceiving many loyal citizens of Dublin, in this particular, dupes to the practices and deceptions of that dangerous, anarchical, blood-thirsty crew. I am fortified in my opinion on this occasion by reflecting, that notwithstanding the hostility of some able, honest men to the measure, men of equal integrity and ability support it, and I think the persons of that des-

cription, friends to it, are much more numerous than those of the same description, who appear in the ranks of the adversary.

I shall first make a few observations on the present state of the natural and political connection between Great-Britain and Ireland. The latter kingdom, from its geographical situation, is shut out from all intercourse with the northern parts of Europe, except by the permission of Great-Britain: and as Great-Britain lies between it and all parts of Europe, from Brittany to the Northern Pole, so it is in its power to prevent, in a great measure, its communication with all the Southern parts of Europe; for Ireland, in respect to all Europe, lies as it were behind Great-Britain; it is also divided from Great-Britain by a narrow channel only, extending the whole length of Ireland from North to South, in some places not above six leagues wide. Its political connection with Great-Britain I shall take up on the basis of its settlement in 1782, which is now insisted upon by the adversaries of an Incorporating Union, as a final settlement between the two king-

doms, never to be changed or altered. Ireland is connected with Great-Britain by having one branch of its Legislative Power, to wit, the regal branch, and the whole of its Executive Power, in common with Great-Britain ; and the person invested with its whole Executive Power, and with a part of its Legislative Power, endowed with a veto on all deliberative resolutions of the other two branches of the Legislative, resides in Great-Britain : By the settlement of 1782, no bill, after it has passed the two Houses of Parliament in Ireland, can become a law, until after it has been sent into Great-Britain, under the Great Seal of Ireland, and is returned from thence under the Great Seal of Great-Britain ; that is, in fact, until after it has been approved of by his Majesty, and his British Cabinet Council ; so that under the settlement of 1782, the British Ministry can prevent the enaction of any law whatsoever in this kingdom ; and it seems to me that there is some inaccuracy in stating the Legislature of this kingdom to be independent under these circumstances. Certain I am, that I have heard grievous complaints of the control of the

British Cabinet exercised over the Legislature of this kingdom, and the disastrous effects on this kingdom of a double Cabinet, English and Irish, very pathetically insisted upon by Gentlemen, who now oppose an Incorporating Union on the principle of its subverting the settlement of 1782, and the independence of this kingdom.

I have been somewhat surprised at finding this House so frequently amused with declamations on the point, whether the settlement of 1782 was intended by the two kingdoms as a final adjustment of all matters then in dispute, so as effectually to secure that perpetual connection necessary to the happiness, almost to the existence of both as free States, and to preclude all future possibility of separation. I look on the question, whether that settlement, at the time it was concluded, was considered or intended to be final or not, as totally immaterial. Debates upon it put me in mind of the conduct of lawyers on a suit, as described by that sagacious observer of mankind, Captain Lemuel Gulliver: "In pleading," says the Captain, "they studiously avoid entering

" into the merits of the cause, but are loud,
" violent and tedious in dwelling upon all cir-
" cumstances which are not to the purpose;
" for instance, if my neighbour claims my
" cow, they never desire to know what title
" my adversary has to my cow, but whether the
" said cow were red or black, her horns long or
" short, whether the field I graze her in were
" round or square, and the like."

The true question on the settlement of 1782 to be resolved by this House, is, Whether that Settlement be such as does effectually secure the perpetual connection of the two kingdoms? and not whether it was considered as final at the time it was entered into.

Sir, the present connection between Great Britain and Ireland is such as has no parallel in the history of the world: it contains in it anomalies heretofore unknown to the law of nations, and the seeds of dissolution; these anomalies must be corrected, and these seeds must be effectually prevented from striking root; which can

be only effected by an Incorporating Union of the two kingdoms. Separation, or rather an unsuccessful attempt at separation, which will be attended with the utter ruin and desolation of this kingdom by civil war, will be the unavoidable and necessary consequence of the rejection of that only effectual remedy.

The present connection between these two kingdoms is not similar to an alliance offensive and defensive between two independent Nations, which depends on stipulations entered into by the two contracting parties for mutual defence and security; for, if the conditions of the alliance are not performed by one of them, the other may break off from the alliance, and look to other security, or take such measures as it may think proper for its own defence, and may at any time enter into leagues and treaties with other Powers, not inconsistent with its offensive and defensive alliance; and either party has a right to proclaim war or make peace on reasonable terms, and to call on the other to assist in war with its stipulated quota, or to concur in a pacification

on reasonable terms, or such as it may deem reasonable; but the case is quite otherwise with Ireland in respect to Great Britain; proclamation of war on the part of Great Britain, against any Power whatsoever, immediately involves Ireland in hostilities, as part of the British Empire, and Great Britain may make Peace without consulting in any manner with Ireland on the terms or conditions, and without stipulating in any manner for her indemnity or compensation for her losses in the war. Ireland cannot enter into any treaty whatsoever, either commercial or otherwise, with any foreign Power, but is bound by all the treaties into which Great Britain enters, without being even consulted on the expediency of them.

Surely, Sir, these are great badges of dependency. I have heard Gentlemen on the other side of the House complain bitterly of them; and, whilst they assert the independence of this Nation on Great Britain, and assert that such independence was secured by the settlement of 1782, and on that score struggle to support that

settle-

Settlement as final, and reprobate all alteration, and consequently an Incorporating Union, they cannot but admit the present connection between the two Nations, as settled in 1782, to be a connection degrading, and in a high degree detrimental to this Nation, and that it contains within itself a mine of combustibles, which, one day or other, will be sprung, and involve the country in confusion, ruin and desolation, which it will take a century to repair.

Exclusive of the aforesaid great imperial sources of discontent and animosity between the two Nations, arising from the very nature of their present connection, are there no other causes of disunion interwoven with it? What loud complaints have we repeatedly heard in this House of the shackled state of our commerce by our present connection with Great Britain since the year 1782? Are these causes removed? It is admitted, that the Settlement of 1782 was not final with respect to the Tariff between the two Nations; we rejected the Commercial Proposi-

tions since 1782, which were designed to settle that Tariff, with disdain, on a supposition that they trenched on our imaginary independence; professing that we would not barter Constitution for Commerce. Is the Channel Trade between Great Britain and Ireland yet settled to our satisfaction? Is the India Trade? Are numberless other causes of discontent, jealousy and emulation on the point of trade between these two commercial and adjacent nations, yet removed? Are the mouths of our ranting Patriots, continually bellowing in our ears, that the interests and pursuits of the two nations in point of trade are incompatible and irreconcileable, and that the animosity of the inhabitants of the two countries is instinctive, yet closed? Or are they ever likely to be closed in the present state of correspondence and brittle connection of the two countries?—surely not, the present connection between them is rather a fatithlest truce, *insidiæ induciæ!* than a permanent state of harmony and peace.

Federal Unions, such as was that of the United Provinces, being an union of a number of small Republics for mutual defence, the present Union

of the several States of America, and of the Germanic Body, have been always accounted weak and inefficient; we know by experience they are so; look to Germany, look to the United Provinces; they will all in process of time submit to the same fate with the United Provinces, that is, be reduced to slavery by a potent neighbour; or will break and separate into distinct Sovereignties independent of each other. Yet the present connection between Great Britain and Ireland is more infirm and fleeting than even a federal Union: for in a federal Union an Assembly is formed by Deputies sent from all the States which compose it, as the States General of the United Provinces, the Diet of the German Empire, the Congress of America, which Assembly is empowered to decide and determine on all matters necessary to their common security and interest, and to whose decisions the whole Union is bound to submit.

But there is no such common Assembly to support the connection between Great Britain and Ireland, and to consult for the respective interests

of both. Such a connection can never be supported but by the decided superiority of the one State, arising from superior strength and opulence, and the decided inferiority of the other in both particulars. Hence it arises, that it will always be the interest of the stronger to retain the weaker in its state of inferiority: And of the weaker to struggle for equality at least, and to endeavour to free itself from subjection to the other by every possible or feasible means. Such a connection is always hollow, attended by tumult and disorders, constantly increasing and fermenting, and at length ending in civil war and absolute subjugation; or separation by the interested assistance of some ambitious neighbour.

The probable durability of the present connection between Great Britain and Ireland cannot be supported by any arguments drawn from the circumstance, that His Majesty and his Progenitors for three generations have enjoyed the Crown of Great Britain, and the Electoral dignity, as Sovereign of Hanover, without any convulsion, or probability of his being disturbed in the en-

joyment of both; it cannot be from thence inferred, that the connection between Great Britain and Ireland, which since 1782, depends on their having a common Sovereign, may be reasonably expected to endure without the prospect of any convulsive pangs of disunion or separation. For the King of Great Britain is not Elector of Hanover, by virtue of his being King of Great Britain. And the interest of Great Britain and Hanover are so completely distinct, that the English Ministry can have no necessity of interfering with the Regency of Hanover, or its interests, external or internal, nor can they ever clash: His Majesty of Great Britain, as Elector of Hanover, is a vassal and subject of the Emperor, and Hanover is a Province of the German Empire, from which it cannot be severed whilst the Germanic body exists; it never can have any further connection with Great Britain than it has at present; and the intercourse between the two countries is extremely confined, as Hanover lies on the Continent, is almost surrounded by the other German Provinces, and has but a very contracted communication with the sea; nor can

there exist any cause of dissention between Great Britain and Hanover, considered as a distinct principality; and the King of Great Britain may ever remain a subject of the Empire, as Elector of Hanover, without the interference of Great Britain to support her title to the Electorate, and without its being at all material to Great Britain, whether he is or is not Elector of Hanover.

But every one of these circumstances are directly reversed when the connection between Great Britain and Hanover is compared with that which has subsisted between Great Britain and Ireland since the year 1782. When Gentlemen insist that the Settlement between the two nations in 1782 is final, and consequently wants no amendment or alteration, that it is of itself sufficient to maintain a perpetual connection between the two Countries, and that any further Union is unnecessary; I cannot but wonder by what arguments, many of them will support their own consistency: whom I have heard arguing with the utmost vehemence in every session of Parliament since that period, for the necessity of alterations in

the established Constitution of Ireland, as well in regard to its internal provisions for the government of the subjects, as in its external regulations respecting its connection with England, which they now assert were finally and for ever settled in 1782:—Witness the complaints of the inequality of the Channel Trade; of the exclusion from the East India Trade; of the importation of English Manufactures; of the contraction of the Colony Trade, and of the Woollen Manufacture of Ireland; of the want of protecting Duties; of the interference of the English Cabinet with Irish Affairs; and of the double Cabinet; of the history of the connection between Great Britain and Ireland, being a history of oppression and injury on the part of Britain, as well before as since the year 1782; of fugacious English Administrations in Ireland, not accountable for their conduct to the Irish Parliament; of Ireland being involved in the wars of Great Britain, without being consulted on the expediency of war or peace, or having any power to promote or obstruct either the one or the other; of the incapacity of Ireland to treat with all foreign

States; its total deprivation of all federative capacity; with a multitude of other inconveniencies, defects and inperfections of the Settlement of 1782, and perpetual declamations on the necessity of Reforms, Emancipations, &c. directly tending to the utter subversion of the present Constitution, and the Settlement of 1782; yet these are the very Gentlemen who now rest their principal arguments against an Incorporating Union on the perfection of the system of 1782; insisting that all attempts further to strengthen the connection between the two realms as settled in 1782, and to extinguish national animosities, are not only unnecessary, but pernicious and destructive to Ireland.

I will now proceed to state and answer the other objections which I have heard urged against an Incorporating Union of the two kingdoms; and I shall have an opportunity, in my progress, of stating, and I hope of proving, the positive advantages which must result to Ireland from it; and the ruin and destruction which will be the certain consequences of its rejection.

It

It is first objected that the independence of Ireland willl be destroyed by an Incorporating Union with Great Britain. I have already pretty fully demonstrated, that Ireland, in its present situation, cannot be considered as an independent kingdom, properly speaking; and, besides, if independence applied to Ireland means *the substantive independence of a kingdom, unconnected with any other Nation, save by treaties of amity containing reciprocal obligations entered into between equals, and possessing an Imperial Government within itself*; it is pretty plain to common understandings, that Ireland, in that sense, is not now an independent Nation; for Ireland is a Province of the British Empire. The Crown of Ireland is not an Imperial Crown; it is inseparably united, annexed to, and dependent upon the Imperial Crown of England (now the Imperial Crown of Great Britain); and whoever is King of Great Britain, is, *ipso facto*, King of Ireland. Such is the language of our own Statute law, repeated over and over again in our Statute books unrepealed, and which never can be repealed; because His Majesty of Great Britain

can never give his royal assent to any law authorising the spoliation of his royal diadem, by tearing the most valuable jewels from it;—unless compelled to it through necessity, and the successful issue of Rebellion: which Heaven avert!

But should it even be admitted that Ireland is an independent Nation, how can it be inferred or proved that she would lose her independence, or any degree of independence which she may now enjoy, by an Incorporating Union with Great Britain? By such Union she becomes one body with Great Britain, and consequently must enjoy equal independence with Great Britain; they will together form one consolidated independent Empire; the part of that Empire West of the Irish Channel will be as independent as that part of England South of the Trent, and that part North of the Trent, or that of Great Britain North of the Tweed; and Ireland will be no more a Province dependent on England than England or Scotland are Provinces dependent on Ireland, or on one another. The objection seems to me to be founded on sophistry,

on this deceitful position, *that each part of the same body, being dependent in some measure upon the rest of the body, the whole, thus composed of parts dependent on each other, cannot be said to form one independent body, because it is composed of dependent particles*; though whilst they adhere together they form one body detached from all others. The Gentlemen who support such a dogma would do well to consider how they can, by such reasoning, maintain the independence of Ireland; for, by the same argument, the four Provinces of Ireland being dependent each on the other three, the four together cannot form one independent body.

It is in the second place objected, that the superior number of British Members in the Imperial Parliament, will give them the power of oppressing Ireland, and infringing the conditions on which an Incorporating Union may be concluded.

I admit that there must be a power in all States paramount and supreme, that can alter or abro-

gate all the laws and regulations of the State, for the manifest good and advantage of the subjects, and enact new laws for the same purposes; but such supreme power is restrained within the bounds of reason and justice, and the present argument is founded on a presumption of fraud and ill-faith, which the principles of natural law, as well as the express maxims of our own municipal law, forbid us to entertain. Our own law tells us that fraud is not to be presumed. When King Henry VIII. consulted the judges, then removable at the will of the Crown, on the question whether a bill of attainder passed against a man by Parliament, then also enslaved, without calling on the object of it to answer, or giving him a trial, would be valid? The judges told him, that such an act, from the transcendant power of Parliament, would be valid; but they trusted that so great and honourable a tribunal as that of Parliament would never degrade itself, and make so flagitious an use of their supreme authority, as to adopt such a proceeding against any man. And an answer of a similar nature might be sufficient to the present objection, the

Parliament being now independent; because there is a mighty difference between power itself, and the just or unjust exercise of it; and the objection can have no weight if we are to presume, as by law we are directed, that the Imperial Parliament will be guided by justice in their proceedings.

But there still remains a more powerful answer to the objection, and that is, that the condition of an Incorporating Union must be canvassed fully in the two Parliaments of Great-Britain and Ireland, before any Union can be effected; and it is morally certain that no conditions will be agreed to, which shall not be deemed by these Parliaments, who are supposed to understand the interests of their country, advantageous as well to the nations respectively, as to the empire at large. And when the two Nations shall become one by an Incorporating Union, can it be supposed that the Imperial Parliament will ever attempt to infringe the conditions promotive of the interests of each country in particular, and of the whole body in general? Such a proceeding with

respect to either country, would injure the whole body, and would be therefore contrary to the interest of the infringers; as it would be destructive of the sanity and strength of the whole human body, for all the parts, the leg excepted, to conspire to wither the leg; therefore there can be no apprehension of the breach of the conditions of an Incorporating Union by the Imperial Parliament, to the prejudice of Ireland; unless we shall suppose that the British Members shall all become blind, as well to justice as to their own interest. Besides, it may be stipulated in the Treaty of Union, that any breach of the conditions shall be deemed a dissolution of the Union, as was done in the Treaty of Union of England and Scotland; and experience has proved, that no attempt at a breach of the conditions of that Union was ever made. I can only conceive one case in which the conditions of an Incorporating Union of Great Britain and Ireland may be altered, and that is, when all or a very great majority of the Representatives of one of the contracting Nations shall petition for an alteration of any of the articles which peculiarly affects one

of them, without any special interest in the other to resist such a change; in that case, I apprehend an alteration might be justly made on the principle of *volenti non fit injuria.*

It is objected thirdly, That Ireland, by an Incorporating Union will become subject to the heavy taxes and debt of Great Britain. This objection may be entirely done away by inserting stipulations in the Treaty of Union, that Ireland shall be only liable to such portion of the public burthen as is suitable to her means and finances. Such stipulations in favour of Scotland have been inserted in the Treaty of Union between England and Scotland, and have never been violated.

But this objection is in truth founded on deception; for it is founded on the baseless assumption, that Ireland, after an Incorporating Union shall take place, will remain in its present situation, or a worse in point of trade, improvement and opulence. Whereas, it is obvious, that Ireland, possessing as fertile a soil as Great Britain, and being, when incorporated with that

Nation, as advantageously situated for commerce, must become in time, and not at a very remote period, equal to Great Britain, in local population, commerce and wealth. Her inhabitants being then on an exact level with those of Great Britain, intermixed with them, and becoming one people with them, the present industrious habits and pursuits of the one Nation, its commerce and its manufactures must be speedily communicated to the other, and become common to both: and when we contemplate the happiness, wealth and comforts of life which the inhabitants of Great Britain enjoy at present in a much superior degree (though liable to the present heavy debts and taxes) to the inhabitants of Ireland, what Irishman would repine or have cause to complain, if the inhabitants of Ireland were put on an exact level in all these particulars with the inhabitants of Great Britain? If we shall, in case of an Incorporating Union, have heavier taxes, they will be no grievances if we shall have more ample sources of wealth, a greater capacity of paying, and greater funds remaining to expend on our comforts and enjoyments.

I am

I am aware that it has been asserted by a very great and truly respectable authority, that the Trade of Ireland cannot and will not be increased by an Incorporating Union; and it has been attempted to be proved that the Trade of Ireland could not be injured by Great Britain, if she should design to injure it, for that Ireland has other and as lucrative markets for her commodities as Great Britain: my own want of skill in commercial affairs, and my settled opinion of the ability and extensive information of the asserter of these doctrines, to me at least novel, induced me, after their publication, to consider them with great attention, to examine the documents on which they were founded, and to read the several answers to them which have appeared, as well in the English as in the Irish prints, and after the very best and most mature consideration of them, I profess I cannot acquiesce in them; for, in the first place, as the proportionate commerce and opulence of Great Britain vastly exceed those of Ireland, I cannot well conceive, when Ireland, situated as she is, and possessing as fertile a soil as Great Britain shall form one and the same body with

Great Britain by an Incorporating Union, that part of that body shall continue in the greatest health and vigour, and that another part with all the vital juices in full and free circulation, without any obstruction whatsoever to impede their course, shall remain in a debilitated and withered state : on the contrary, I am clearly of opinion, that the wealth and commerce of Great Britain must by an Union be communicated to Ireland, and that Ireland will thereby acquire a proportionate and local equality in trade with Great Britain and every part of it.

In the second place, I am convinced that Ireland is indebted for almost her whole commerce to Great Britain ; she has opened to Ireland the trade of her colonies ; she has shielded her principal manufactures, to which she has opened her own markets, with bounties, and restrained the importation of manufactures of the same nature from other countries by duties. At no other markets on the face of the globe could the manufactures of Ireland be disposed of to the same advantage ; she affords a ready market, ready sale, and speedy return for the commodities of Ireland,

which no other nation could afford, and which few would offer: nor could Irish capitals support the same trade with other nations, who would require longer credits. British fleets secure the foreign commerce of Ireland throughout the globe, and the hostility of Great Britain to Ireland would at once annihilate almost all Irish commerce and manufactures; and the balance of trade between Great Britain and Ireland is much in favour of the latter kingdom.

It is objected, that the City of Dublin will be depopulated and injured, and its trade ruined by an Incorporating Union. Of all the objections against the measure, this has the greatest weight with the mass of the people, and yet it is infinitely the weakest. Such has been the power of deception, that this fallacious argument has imposed upon and mislead the loyal citizens of Dublin, who in the late atrocious Rebellion so courageously sood forth the champions and the bulwarks of the Constitution in Church and State, and has so far blinded their understandings as to render them careless even of their own preservation,

of their liberties and properties, and induced them to permit themselves to be made the dupes and tools of the sanguinary Jacobin traitors, who so lately deluged their country with the best Protestant blood of the Nation.

The Conspirators who originally planned that bloody insurrection, and the ruffians employed in the massacres with which it was accompanied, and whose carcases, justly forfeited to the law, have been bailed from the executioner, by what has been stiled the lenity of Government, now openly and triumphantly appear, leading the deluded citizens to the altars of rebellion, conspiracy and sedition, there to enter into engagements for the subversion of the constitution, and to affix their signatures, at the desire of the pardoned and ungrateful traitors, to the manifestoes of threatened and meditated insurrection. Bound as I am from general, and in many instances personal attachment, gratitude and interest, to promote to the extremity of my abilities the welfare and prosperity of the city of Dublin, in which though not my native place, I have been nurtured and

educated from my early infancy; and which comprehends so many of my closest and most valuable connections, I cannot view with indifference this fatal delusion of many of its most loyal and worthy citizens. I heartily deplore it, and shall use my endeavours to awaken them to the calls of loyalty, honour, security and peace.

I have already, I trust, proved that the trade and wealth of Ireland must be increased by an Union, which will open sources of commerce yet unknown in this country; it will increase wealth in the same proportion, and capital must increase by the additional security which the lives and properties of the inhabitants of Ireland will acquire by such Union; and the city of Dublin must participate largely in the increased commerce, wealth and capital of the Nation at large. Dublin is situated about midway in the Irish Channel. Its port, though not accessible by ships of as great burthen as that of Liverpool, yet is a much better port than that of the latter place, much more easily accessible, and ships of

three or four hundred tons, large enough for carrying on commerce to any part of the globe, may resort to it. Dublin is capable of receiving great improvements as a commercial city, sufficient to secure to it for ever a decided superiority in point of trade over every other town in Ireland; and if an annual sum shall be appropriated out of the treasury for compleating the two canals which communicate with it on the North and South (already far advanced), under proper regulations, so as to finish the water carriage from Dublin in the Shannon, it will extend into Connaught, and may be further extended in that province by means of the river Suck. Such an improvement will for ever secure to Dublin the exclusive import and export trade of this island, in a tract of country the best in the kingdom, of near one hundred miles broad, and reaching almost from the Channel to the Western Ocean. The compleating these canals, at the public expence, may be made one of the articles of the Union, and will alone compensate tenfold for any partial loss which it is suggested that Dublin may suffer by it; for it is not even pretended that the

Nation at large will suffer by an Union, in point of commerce; all that is attempted to be proved (and the proof has totally failed) is, that Ireland will not gain in point of trade by this measure. Other advantages to the city of Dublin, not prejudicial to the kingdom at large, may be stipulated for in the Treaty of Union.

We are now to consider what the loss is, that it is suggested the city will sustain by an Incorporating Union. It is suggested, that many other port towns will rise in commerce on the ruins of that of Dublin in case of an Union: I cannot see any reasonable ground for such suggestion; but if there is any, I have already pointed out an effectual method, not only to secure Dublin in its present trade, but to increase it to a degree hitherto never experienced or hoped for.

It is next suggested, that Dublin will decay as well in population as trade, by its ceasing to be the annual place of meeting of Parliament; and that absentees will be increased, as well from Dublin as from the rest of the kingdom, by an

Union, which will therefore drain the kingdom in general, and Dublin in particular, of great sums of money annually. I cannot think that the kingdom in general, or Dublin in particular, will be drained of great sums of money by the increase of absentees, which, it is supposed, will happen on an Union taking place, for I do not think that it will cause any very material increase of absentees. Already our absentees, and most of them of very great landed estates, are very numerous, and most of our Nobility and considerable Gentry, who are reputed residents, spend their summers, or a considerable part of them, in England, either in or near London, or at the several watering places in England. Thirty of our Peers, and one hundred of our Commoners, are to sit in the Imperial Parliament; of these Commoners sixty-four are to be elected for the counties at large, eighteen more for cities or towns, which are also counties, and the remainder for corporate towns, considerable for their population and extent: so that almost the whole of the Irish Representatives in the Commons of the Imperial Parliament, will be returned on popular elections.

tions. And all, such persons, to secure their interests in the counties and towns which they represent, will be obliged to spend their summers (the seasons of recess of the Imperial Parliaments) among their Irish constituents, instead of spending them, as they now do, in England. Of the thirty Peers, who are to represent the Irish Peerage in the Imperial Parliament, many will be such as at present spend their whole time, or almost the whole, in England; from whence I infer, that Ireland in general will not suffer considerably, perhaps not at all, by an Union. The city of Dublin will certainly lose the partial residence of some of the Members of Parliament annually, but not of all; for many persons who are now Members of the Irish Parliament, such as the whole body of lawyers now in Parliament, and many others who always reside in or near Dublin, and who will not be of the number elected to the Imperial Parliament, will continue to reside in their usual places of abode. The city will continue the metropolis of the kingdom, the seat of the Courts of Justice, and of the Viceroy;

and upon the whole, cannot, by any computation, suffer any greater annual loss than about fifty thousand pounds, perhaps less, by an Union; and will certainly be a gainer of several hundreds of thousands annually by the means I have suggested, and by other stipulations in its favour, which may be inserted in the Treaty of Incorporating Union. And the city of Dublin will be certainly increased, as well in wealth as population, by such a measure.

Pending the treaty for an Union between England and Scotland, the same methods for inflaming the inhabitants of Edinburgh to oppose that measure, were adopted by a discontented party in that kingdom, as are now made use of to inflame the citizens of Dublin. Yet Edinburgh, in less than a century since that Union took place, has been more than doubled in extent and in population; and in trade, wealth and magnificence, improved tenfold. My arguments are therefore warranted, not by reason only, but experience: and the citizens of Dublin will soon have good cause to reprobate and execrate the fraudulent

and sanguinary jacobinical assassins, by whom they are at present so fatally misled.

It is in the fifth place objected, that the Irish Parliament is not competent to enter into and conclude a treaty with the Sister Kingdom for an Incorporating Union. The competency of the Irish Parliament to such a measure, has been so fully and ably proved by an Honourable Member of this House, in his Speech on the expediency of an Union in the last Session of Parliament, which Speech has been since printed *: and the futility and ineptitude of the objection so fully exposed, that it is not necessary for me to be at much trouble in scouting that phantom of forensian quibbling inanity out of this House. A brief examination of this doctrine of incompetency of Parliament on the present occasion, may however be not amiss.

The best writers on the British Constitution,

* Speech of W. Smith, Esq. on the Subject of a Legislative Union, Thursday, January 24, 1799.

and those who have wound up their ideas of true political liberty to the highest tone which can consist with any harmony or stability of Government, Mr. Locke in particular, lay it down as a maxim, that each member of the commonwealth has surrendered to the state, or supreme legislative power, and vested in it all his rights under the law of nature. In the 11th chapter of Mr. Locke's Treatise on Government, is to be found the following passage: "The supreme legislative power "in every commonwealth is the joint power of "every member of the society, given up to that "person or assembly which is legislator, and is "what those persons had in a state of nature "before they entered into the society, and gave "up to the community." A little farther on he adds, "This power, in the utmost bounds of "it, is limited to the public good of the so-"ciety." And in the close of the 19th chapter he writes thus, "The power which every indi-"vidual gave the society, when he entered into "it, can never revert to the individual again, as "long as the society lasts, but will always remain "in the community; because without this there "can be no community, no commonwealth,

" which is contrary to the original agreement.
" So also, when the society hath placed the Le
" gislative in any Assembly of men to continue
" in them and their successors, with direction
" and authority of providing such successors,
" the Legislative (which he in all places styles
" the Supreme Power) can never revert to the
" People whilst that Government lasts: Because
" having provided a Legislative with power to
" continue for ever, they have given up their
" political power to the Legislative, and can
" never resume it." Montesquieu, in the 6th Chapter of his 11th Book, where he treats of the English Constitution, lays it down as a maxim: " That the People ought to have no
" share in the Government, but for the choos-
" ing of Representatives, which is within their
" reach." It is notorious, that a man in a state of nature has full authority and power to join any other man or set of men, and to form with them a community, or to connect himself with a community already formed, and become a member of that community which is willing to receive him as a member. This natural right each man has given up to the community, and

the Supreme Legislative Power of the community is invested with that right, and consequently is competent to join any other community or commonwealth in an Incorporating Union, and to bind all the subjects of the State to that incorporation; and that power of the Legislative is bounded only by the public good of the society, of which it is a better judge than tumultuous, unconstitutional, and illegal assemblies of the people, and of which, the members of the commonwealth, when they elected them their Representatives, supposed them to be the best judges.

Mr. Locke published his Treatise on Government in the year 1690: he had been the Secretary and Confidant of the famous Earl of Shaftesbury; and had been educated at Oxford, during the domination of the republican fanatics, and was brought up in the extremity of Whig principles, and published his work at the time civil dissensions were at the highest, for the purpose of justifying the Revolution, at that time a recent transaction not compleatly and fully established,

One principal accusation against the abdicated family was, that they designed to subjugate the kingdom to France. This design was principally attributed to Charles the Second and his Ministry, and was one of the accusations of Lord Shaftesbury, the patron of Mr. Locke, against the Court in the reign of that Monarch. Mr. Locke, therefore, in his 19th Chapter on the Dissolution of Governments, states, rather too largely, " that the alteration of the Legislative " is a dissolution of Government:" And then subjoins, " that the delivery of the People into " the subjection of a foreign Power, either by " the Prince, or the Legislative, is certainly a " change of the Legislative, and so a dissolution " of the Government."

In respect to the first position of Mr. Locke, that a change of the Legislative is a dissolution of Government, I believe the Gentlemen who oppose this measure, will scarcely subscribe to the truth of it: for they have for a series of years been preaching up the necessity of a change in the Legislative, as well by abolishing most of

the Boroughs, as by new-modelling the remainder; and by extending the Elective Franchise to large bodies of the People, heretofore disqualified by the laws of the commonwealth: Some of which pretended reforming schemes have succeeded, and all which would immediately operate as alterations in the Legislative Body.

But it is necessary to advert to the second position of Mr. Locke, and to try whether the conclusion of a Treaty of Incorporating Union with Great Britain by the Irish Legislature, on terms of absolute equality and communication of all privileges, can be deemed a delivery of the Irish Nation into a subjection to a *foreign* Power. It is to be observed in the first place, that Great Britain in respect to Ireland is not a *foreign* Power; both Nations compose one Empire, whose interests with respect to all other Nations are one and the same. Secondly, the Legislatures of the two Nations are not distinct and separate in their present condition: for one branch of the Legislative, and the Supreme Executive, is one and the same in both. Thirdly, the Irish Legislative

lative is not a supreme power in Ireland, for the exercise of its authority may be at all times cramped and impeded by the English Cabinet in many and most instances; and it has no federative or imperial authority respecting foreign nations, nor has its Executive any such authority, as derived from the Irish Legislature; and if the Irish Legislature vested their whole legislative authority in the British Legislature, such a proceeding would not amount to the subjection of the Irish Nation to a *foreign* Power, even on Mr. Locke's principles, and to a consequent dissolution of Government.

But an Incorporating Union with Great Britain admits of no such interpretation, as the delivery of the Irish Nation to a *subjection to Great Britain.* Irish Peers and Irish Representatives of the Commons will sit in the Imperial Parliament with equal privileges, liberties, and immunities with British Peers and British Representatives; the superior numbers of the latter classes to those of the former, arising from the superior extent and opulence of the British Nation, can never, as I

trust I have already proved, operate to the peculiar disadvantage of Ireland; there can be no inequality of interest between the limbs of the same body, and consequently no subjection, except the due subordination of all the parts of a body, to serve in their respective functions for the general and common advantages of the whole, be subjection. The Representative form of Government will be preserved in its purity and vigour, under the same Sovereign, the same Executive; and no objection on the score of change of the Legislature can, as I apprehend, come with any degree of consistency from the opposite side of the House, founded on the diminution, or rather annihilation, of the Irish Borough Representation in the new system, which Representation they have so often declaimed against, nor from the junction of the Peerage and Representatives of the Commons in both Nations in the same Houses, upon perfect terms of equality; bound together by the ties of common interest, to provide for the safety and prosperity of the whole Empire in general, and of each Nation in particular.

The last objection which I have heard urged against an Incorporating Union, is, that Ireland will be thereby reduced to the condition of a dependent Province. To this it is a full answer, that Ireland, by an Incorporating Union, will become, from a really dependent Province, a part of the British Empire, equally independent with every other part of it; that England and Scotland are Provinces of the British Empire, and Ireland will be a Province no more dependent on any Power whatsoever, than England and Scotland are; all the Provinces of an Empire, such as the British, the very basis of whose Government is political Liberty, are so far dependent, the one on the other, as that they are all obliged to concur in the means for their common preservation, and without such concurrence they would all yield to a foreign Power: in such light, but in no other, are they dependent, the one on the other, for mutual defence and security: and may they ever continue in that sense dependent, and be for ever indissolubly United!

It is worth while now to bestow a little consideration on what will be the fate of Ireland, in case an Incorporating Union be rejected. In the first place it is evident, from the various causes of dispute and animosity between Great Britan and Ireland, now subsisting under their present system of precarious and imperfect connection, and from the turbulence, avarice and ambition of some, and the jacobinical, anarchical, revolutionary principles of other agitators, with whom the country is at present cursed; who have falsely assumed, and thereby debased and degraded the title of Patriots; and from the bitter and malignant spirits of a great portion of the lower order of our inhabitants, inspired by the principles of a gloomy, unsociable, unrelenting, sanguinary superstition, that the two Nations cannot be kept together for any considerable time by their present frail and brittle bonds of connection. Separation, therefore, or rather an attempt at separation, from Britain, will be the certain consequence of the rejection of this measure. I will first assume, that a sufficient attempt at separation shall be effected, it must, if at all, be effected by Re-

bellion and the assistance of a French army: the civil war will waste this unhappy country from one extremity to the other; and exclusive of the miserable slaughter attendant on a civil war, the whole moveable property of the nation, and all its improvements, will be destroyed and ruined, and the successful surviving rebel will have the miserable triumph of subjecting himself and his posterity to the bondage of France, and becoming a member of a wretched, impoverished, democratic Republic, which will itself be a slave to the French democracy.

Ye Protestants of Ireland! let me call your attention to what will be your lot in such an event. No successful attempt at separation can be made without your assistance and co-operation; you are now possessed of infinitely the greatest portion of the wealth and property, moveable and immoveable, of the Nation. You will therefore be infinitely the greatest losers by a Rebellion, which will be a gulf to swallow up all property; you must associate yourselves and be companions in arms with the hungry French assassins, and

murderous crew of United Irishmen; you do not amount to more than one-third of the inhabitants of Ireland, the other two-thirds are your mortal enemies, as well on the score of your religion, as your riches: when you shall have assisted in your own ruin, and separated yourselves from Britain, and concurred in establishing a democratic Irish Republic; when you shall be reduced to the same equality of indigence which in such case must be the lot of all, when perfect equality of beggary is introduced, and the Irish Nation is become the vassal of France, do you expect that you will have any security for your lives? Will the descendants of the Irish murderers in 1641, who massacred in cold blood such multitudes of your ancestors, now double your numbers, and on a level with you in all other respects, and assisted by the sanguinary French robbers in the event of successful Rebellion, abstain from their habits of murder? Does their recent conduct at Scollabogue, at Wexford, at Vinegar-Hill, inspire you with hopes of safety, when they shall have you in their power? As well may the trembling hind, inclosed in the paws of the ravenous

hungry tiger, hope for mercy! The pike and the skeine will soon dispatch such of you as may survive the horrors and miseries of even a successful Rebellion.

And you, ye deluded Citizens of Dublin! whom traitors have found means to detach from your true interests, have you ever considered what is to be the unavoidable fate of your City in case of a separation from Great Britain—which, as I have already stated, can never be effected except by rebellion and desolation? Even one year's war between Great Britain and Ireland would annihilate your trade, as well as the trade of the whole Eastern coast of Ireland.—The naval force of Liverpool alone, which in the war before the present almost annihilated the trade of France, would completely lock up all the Irish ports in the Channel, and would not suffer one ship to sail in or out of them; and in case of a separation of the two Countries, as they would certainly be in a state of almost perpetual war, whatever trade Ireland would enjoy, and it could be very little, its Western ports would en-

gross it, and Dublin would be effectually ruined. Such a state of separation, effected by a successful rebellion, would, in fact, in the first place desolate the kingdom, and destroy one-half of its inhabitants; and in the next place would deprive the whole Nation of almost all trade, thereby prevent its recovery, and reduce it to, and keep it in, the most miserable situation that any nation could possibly be reduced to.

All that I have here mentioned would be the inevitable consequences of a successful rebellion, and consequent separation; but what would be the effects of an unsuccessful rebellion in the cause of meditated separation? For it is morally certain that such rebellion and such attempt would be unsuccessful. No person who knows the situation natural and political of Great Britain and Ireland, can deny, that Ireland of itself is unable to cope with Great Britain, even if the inhabitants of Ireland were unanimous: but it is notorious, in case a rebellion was to break out for separation, that the country would be divided, and that before such rebellion could rage for one

year

year, all the Protestants of Ireland, that is, almost the whole property of the kingdom, would find it their interest to join the King's standard. The bloody, remorseless cruelty, and insatiable thirst for plunder, of the rest of their countrymen, would soon convince them of the necessity of using their arms against them. The present feeble state of the French marine, and the exhausted state of that wretched nation in general, would deprive the rebels of any effectual assistance from that quarter. When the whole Irish Nation, (a handful of Protestants in the North of the kingdom excepted) took arms in the year 1688 in favour of King James the Second, and the French Monarch, Louis the Fourteenth, at that time in the zenith of his glory, sent a French army, and an immense supply of military stores to their assistance, and when his navy rode triumphant on the ocean, England reduced the whole kingdom to the most abject submisson in two campaigns ; and similar would be the event of any Irish Rebellion undertaken in the cause of separation ; but it will be attended

with infinite calamity to the inhabitants of Ireland of all descriptions.

WE HAVE NOW OUR CHOICE; whether we will rush on our own ruin, or embrace with joy the measure of an INCORPORATING UNION, the sure pledge of national Happiness, Prosperity, and Security. Unconnected as I am with the Government, or its Ministers, both in England and Ireland, and attached to it only as a good and loyal subject, in spite of clamour and faction, I must express my sincere wish that the Nation may adopt the latter measure. I have long since made my choice;

Non ardor Civium prava jubentium
Mente quatit solidâ.

THE END.

Printed by T. Baylis, Greville-Street, Hatton-Garden.

BINDING SECT. MAR 8 1968

DA
949
D8
1802

Duigenan, Patrick
History of the Irish
rebellion New ed.

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY